DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 008 CE 026 178

AUTHOR Allen, Robert W.; Foster, Robert R.
TITLE Washington State Public Service Employment: Training and Transition Project. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Producivity Assoc., Vashon, Wash.
SPONS AGENCY Washington State Emplcyment Dept., Olympia. Employment and Training Div.
PUB DATE Jun 80
NOTE 85p.; Parts of some pages may not reprcduce well due to thin type.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Vocational Education; Career Planning; *Economically Disadvantaged; *Educational Opportunities; *Education Work Relationship; Employers; Employment Potential; *Employment Programs; Evaluatien; *Federal Programs; Job Skills; *Job Training; Participation; Postsecondary Education; Skill Develcpment; Surveys; Unemployment; Vocational Education; Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Public Service Employment; Washington

ABSTRACT

A project reviewed and assessed the sccpe and availability of Public Service Employment (PSE) participant training. It explored alternatives on how training resources can be utilized and best administered to maximize participant transitien to unsubsidized employment. Project phases were program administrator interviews, employing agency and participant surveys, and assessment workshops. It was found that traditional resources (community college, vocational-technical schools, and continuing education programs) are valuable but not sufficient to meet training demands. Special structured training and apprenticeship programs should be developed. PSE participants need skill develcpment training directly related to a realistic transition plan or career goal. All key people should be involved in developing an Employability Development Plan comprised of a strong skill and career assessment program leading to a training plan. The rcle of employing agencies in training should be expanded. The Average Annual Wage Restriction has redirected PSE as a training prcgram serving the most needy. PSE training and work experience should be coordinated with private sector labor market needs. Difficulties exist in rural areas and in prime sponsor adjustment to regulation changes. Reccmmendations to pclicy makers were also formulated. (Appendixes, amounting to over one-half of the report, include interview and survey results and workshop discussion summary.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED192008

WASHINGTON STATE

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT: TRAINING AND TRANSITION PROJECT

FINAL REPORT

JUNE, 1980

Prepared by:

PRODUCTIVITY ASSOCIATES

ROBERT W. ALLEN
Human Resources Specialist

ROBERT R. FOSTER
Human Resources Specialist

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert W. Allen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 026 178

Prepared with funds made available under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), Special Grants to Governors. Employment and Training Division, Employment Security Department.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary	1
II.	Introduction	4
III.	Methodology	6
IV.	Results	10
V.	Recommendations	26
VI.	Appendices	
	1. PSE Program Administrators Interview Guide	33
	2. PSE Program Administrators Interview Summary	36
	3. Employing Agency Survey Sampling Matrix	44
	4. Employing Agency Survey - Statewide Results	45
	5. PSE Participant Survey - Statewide Results	50
	6. Agencies Registered for Regional Assessment Workshops	55
	7. Regional Assessment Workshop Discussion Summary	68

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Public Service Employment (PSE) is funded by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) to provide training and experience for unemployed persons by placing them in jobs with state agencies, local governmental entities or private nonprofit organizations. The PSE Program is composed of two major employment titles, Title II-D and Title VI. Title II-D is a transitional Public Service Employment Program designed to provide unemployed, economically disadvantaged persons with interim jobs. Congress has recently put special emphasis on this title by mandating in April , 1979, specific training expenditure levels (10% in FY 79, 15% in FY 80 and 20% in FY 81). Title VI is a counter-cyclical Public Service Employment Program for people who are unemployed because of bad times and setbacks in the economy. This study concentrates primarily on Title II-D because of the increased emphasis on training and transitioning low skilled and economically disadvantaged individuals.

As a result of the new program emphasis in the Public Service Employment Program (PSE), it is important to identify and assess the factors and training strategies which may assist in the transitioning of participants. Additionally, it is important to gather valid and useful information that assesses the impact of the new law and federal regulations and provide that information to PSE program operators and policy planners to assist in decision-making and problem-solving. To meet this need, the Employment and Training Division of the Washington State Employment Security Department made available (through a Request-for-Proposal process) funds from the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Special Grants to Governors for a statewide "Public Service Employment Training and Transition Project".

The purpose of the PSE Training and Transition Project was to review and assess the scope and availability of PSE participant training and explore alternatives on how training resources can be utilized and best administered to maximize participant transition to unsubsidized employment. The Project resulted in the following major findings*:

- Training Resources Utilized
  While traditional resources such as community college, vocational-technical schools, private seminars and continuing education programs are extremely valuable, they are not sufficient to meet the training demands of Title II-D. Special structured training and apprenticeship programs need to be developed that use labor organizations, private employers, professional organizations, retired citizens and other non-traditional sources as instructors.

---

*For a more detailed discussion of these findings, the methodology of the project, and recommendations for how best to approach the training of PSE participants, and other issues raised by the project, please refer to the body of this report.

- Type of Training Needed
  PSE participants need primarily skill development training directly related to a realistic transition plan or career goal based upon a strong assessment of the individual participant's skills and interests.

- Employability Development Planning Process
  All key people should be involved in the development of an Employability Development Plan (EDP), i.e. the participant, the employing agency supervisor, and the PSE counselor and/or training coordinator. The EDP, in far too many cases, is merely a paperwork exercise. It should be comprised of a strong front-end skill and career assessment program leading to a training plan which includes work readiness and basic survival skill training (e.g. financial planning, career planning, values clarification, grooming, self-image building, specific skill development and job search and job placement training utilizing instructors familiar with the local job market resources.

- Role of Employing Agencies in Training
  Further clarification is needed in the Prime Sponsor jurisdiction as to the role Employing Agencies should play in identifying and providing training. In many cases, given adequate technical support, the Employing Agencies can be utilized as a valuable training resource.

- Average Annual Wage Restriction
  PSE participant wages must fall within a limited amount depending upon how local unsubsidized wages compare to the national average ($7,200 annually in FY 79). This restriction has resulted in many traditional employers dropping out completely or severely curtailing their involvement in PSE. Some large statewide employers are finding it difficult to adjust their personnel systems to the "trainee" orientation of PSE, particularly in light of differences in the maximum average annual wage paid in different counties. Also, the support by organized labor is threatened by the wage restriction. The Average Annual Wage restriction has, however, had a major impact in changing the direction of PSE away from a "jobs program" to a training program serving those most in need.

- Private Sector Coordination
  There is an increasing need to coordinate PSE training and work experience with the labor market needs of the private sector incorporating current labor market analysis.

- Rural Area Problems
  Due to a relative scarcity of accessible training resources and available unsubsidized placements for transition, rural areas are having difficulties in meeting the intent of the new regulations requiring increased levels of training expenditures. New sources of training need to be developed in these rural areas, e.g. specialized training plans using certified tutors recruited locally.

- Prime Sponsor Adjustment to the April, 1979, Regulation Changes in PSE
  In general, Prime Sponsors and Program Agents have had a difficult time adjusting to the new requirements of PSE Title II-D. About one-third of the jurisdictions report that they will have difficulty meeting the FY 80 training expenditure levels. They needed the first year to wind down their old programs and to re-educate their Employing Agencies and communities to the new Title II-D PSE Program. However, a positive problem-solving approach is currently being taken by all Prime Sponsors to meet the intent of the "new look" Public Service Employment Program.

INTRODUCTION

This Project was made possible by CETA Special Governor Grant Administrative Funds. The recent re-authorization of CETA (April, 1979) has had a considerable impact on the overall direction and the day-to-day operation of Public Service Employment programs. This project was designed to assess this impact and to review and evaluate the scope and availability of PSE participant training and explore alternatives on how training resources can be utilized and best administered to maximize participant transition to unsubsidized employment. The underlying process used was to systematically gather practical information regarding the often complex issues and problems facing PSE administrators, and to present this information to the individuals involved in operating PSE programs to act as a basis for meaningful problem-solving at the local, state, and federal levels.

To accomplish this goal the Project was divided into the following phases:

A. Program Administration Interviews
B. Employing Agency and Participant Surveys
C. Assessment Workshops
D. Final Report

Each phase of the Project relied heavily on the interest and involvement of Prime Sponsors and Program Agent* administrators and staff, as well as staff from the Employing Agencies and the local Job Service Centers (JSC's), without whose help this Project would never have been successfully completed. We cannot be appreciative enough of these busy people who took time to meet us in interview settings and at workshops and who filled out our "one more" questionnaire. Special mention should be made here of the cooperative and professional leadership and support provided by the Employment and Training Division of the Washington State Employment Security Department and Ms. Ginger Rich, Project Manager, who conceptualized the Project and provided the determination and hard work to get

*The Public Service Employment Program is administered by Prime Sponsors. A Prime Sponsor is a general unit of government or a consortium of governments which have a population of 100,000 or more.

In the State of Washington there are nine Title II Prime Sponsors:

- King-Snohomish Manpower Consortium
- City of Tacoma
- Pierce County
- Clark County
- Yakima County
- Thurston County
- Spokane City-County Consortium
- Balance of State
- Kitsap County

Program Agents may also administer the PSE Program for a specific geographic jurisdiction. A Program Agent is a unit of local government with a population of at least 50,000 within a single Prime Sponsor.

Within the nine Prime Sponsor jurisdictions there are seven Program Agents

- Whatcom County
- Skagit County
- Snohomish County
- King County
- Cowlitz County
- City of Seattle
- E.S. CETA Services B'BOS

it implemented. Most significant in our minds are the PSE participants in Washington State in whose interest this Project was undertaken. A significant number of them took part in our survey and are to be commended for the excellent comments and suggestions they offered us. It is for them that we request this report be widely read and disseminated and that there be follow-up as suggested.

METHODOLOGY

Program Administrators Interviews

The initial phase of the PSE Training and Transition Project involved a series of structured, on-site interviews with PSE Administrators from Washington State's seventeen Prime Sponsor and Program Agent jurisdictions held from January 22 to February 6, 1980*. The purpose of these interviews was to establish a cooperative, working relationship between our Project office and the field administrators, to discuss with them the identification of issues and problem areas surrounding PSE and to get their ideas and suggestions for the composition of the projected Employing Agency and Participant Surveys. Intensive interviews were conducted with all administrators based on a formal interview guide. (See Appendix 1.) The raw notes from these interviews were sorted, distilled and clustered for each of the thirty interview questions. This information in turn was further compressed into categories representing current PSE training practices and issues. Thus we arrived at an overview of Washington State PSE training, the Program Administrators Survey. (See Appendix 2). This nine-page document identifies eleven PSE training and transition issues of most concern to and most frequently heard on the CETA PSE administrative level:

- Employer attitudes and perceptions,
- Participant attitudes and orientation,
- Average Annual Wage restrictions,
- Training,
- Bureaucratic requirements
- Accounting and administrative burdens,
- Long-range planning,
- Employment Development Planning (EDP),
- Transition,
- Rural area issues, and
- Supportive and post-termination services.

---

*King-Snohomish Manpower Consortium: Leon Grundstein, Scott Winslow
City of Tacoma: Jenny Allen
Pierce County: Jim Sloan
Clark County: Elaine Maull, Terry Stauffer
Yakima County: Jerry Baladose, Colleen McKeown
Thurston County: Forrest Cole
Spokane City-County: John Baumhofer
Balance of State: Nancy Pringle
Kitsap County: Doug Booth, Bob Melton
Whatcom County: Stuart Hansen
Skagit County: Bob Cook
Snohomish County: Pete Van Miegham
King County: Roger Caley
Cowlitz County: Frank Schubert, Mary Stone
City of Seattle: John Franklin, Larry Bianchi
ES, CETA Services: Larry Malo, Janet Hansen, Frank Hoffman
King-Snohomish ES: Keith Williams, Dave Berg

These issues were to form the basis for questions on both the Employing Agency and Participant Surveys, which were then in the formative stages, and for virtually all other activities during the balance of the Training and Transition Project. The Summary also contained a review of various training practices and new directions discovered in the field.

The Program Administrators Summary was disseminated February 14, 1980, along with draft Employing Agency and Participant Surveys which we included to elicit further comment, corrections, and suggestions for improvement. At the same time, Program Administrators were asked to supply us with mailing lists of Employing Agencies within their jurisdictions receiving Title II, VI and VI Project funding so that we could randomly select agencies to receive surveys. Based on these lists, a sampling matrix (see Appendix 3) was drawn up. Across the vertical axis on the matrix all Primes and Program Agents were listed, for a total of fifteen. Across the horizontal axis, six categories of Employing Agencies were listed: county, city, state, private nonprofits, school districts, and other public agencies. Within each of the resulting ninety cells (six times fifteen), the total number of agencies was displayed that corresponded to the actual number of Employing Agencies existing within that subcharacteristic. This became the "N" for that cell. From each "N", a random sample was chosen. Subcharacteristic sample sizes ranged from a minimum of 20% to 100%. The total sample size was 34% of the total "N", or 607 of 1,776 Employing Agencies. We also asked the Primes and Program Agents to provide us with a randomly selected 10% sample of active PSE participants, 709 of 7,090. By March 10, 1980, surveys were sent to all selected participants and Employing Agencies.

The Surveys

The final Employing Agency and Participant Surveys were not solely the product of our Project office. The final shape of the surveys was determined in a formal way by the input received from the Project Manager and CETA PSE Administrators.

The purpose of both surveys was to discover new and further delineate already identified PSE training and transition issues as a means of building momentum and further identifying a political constituency for discussing and, finally, solving these issues.

The Employing Agency Survey contained thirty-six questions covering such issues as the EDP process, PSE training, CETA support services to Employing Agencies, the orientation of Employing Agencies, the provision of release time to participants, paperwork requirements, transitioning participants, and PSE funding. The Participant Survey covered many of the same issues from the perspective of the subsidized employee.

Response to the surveys was gratifying; 48% of the participants responded to the blind survey. No follow-up was conducted for non-respondents. Of 709 surveys mailed to participants, 315 were returned. The response rate for the Employing Agency Survey was 69%; of the 607 surveys mailed, 419 were returned. This was due in large part to an extensive telephone follow-up effort for non-responding agencies.

The data collected from the surveys was summarized and reported back to Program Administrators. Each Prime Sponsor and Program Agent received the Employing Agency Survey results broken out for their jurisdiction by each of the Employing Agency categories as well as the statewide total (see Appendix 4) so that they could compare their local data with the statewide data. Survey results for each of the Employing Agency sub-characteristics, by each Prime Sponsor/Program Agency and the statewide totals for each subcharacteristic were computed and summarized.*

A statewide summary of the results of the PSE Participant Survey (see Appendix 5) was calculated, summarized, and disseminated to Program Administrators. These results were also broken out by rural and urban areas and the six major Employing Agency categories*.

Workshops

PSE Program Administrators were invited to attend one of the seven regional assessment workshops. They were also asked to identify additional participants for the workshops who met one of the following criteria: Staff within Prime Sponsor or Program Agent responsible for PSE training and transition or involved with planning, coordinating and/or service delivery of PSE programs and have an interest in PSE training and transition issues (e.g. Employing Agencies, community colleges, vocational education subcontractors, etc.).

All Employing Agencies who received a survey were sent a workshop interest form which was designed to assess the degree of interest they had in attending local assessment workshops to follow up the compiled survey data. Through this process, approximately 180 CETA PSE Administrators and representatives from Employing Agencies were assigned to regional workshops scheduled in Bellingham (April 29), Seattle (April 30), Tacoma (May 1), Olympia (May 2), Wenatchee (May 5), Spokane (May 7), and Tri-Cities (May 9) (see Appendix 6). Two pre-workshop mailings were sent out to registrants: one containing an agenda with workshop objectives, the other comprising a pre-workshop packet containing a letter of appreciation from a CETA PSE participant, summary results of both the Employing Agency and Participant Surveys, the Program Administrators Summary and a Guide for Task Groups to help workshop participants through small-group problem-solving.

The objectives of the workshops were: 1) to review and follow up on the issues identified in the surveys; 2) to identify relevant barriers to training and transition which can potentially be eliminated; and 3) to develop strategies and specific action steps to accomplish goals related to improving training and transition.

---

*This information is available for further study. Contact Washington State Employment Security Department, Employment and Training Division, MS: EL-01, 1007 S. Washington, Olympia, WA 98504.

The workshops were to operate using a small group problem-solving model. They began with introductory comments and some general discussion designed to bring out training and transition programs and practices that were going well in individual organizations and jurisdictions, followed by a discussion of issues which the group felt needed attention. In the afternoon the group was divided into discussion groups where a specialized action-planning technique was to be utilized for problem-solving. The small groups were to report back to the larger group and the resultant issues for follow-up were to be the "product" of the workshop.

As the sequence of workshops progressed around the state, it was found that the workshop participants were most strongly drawn to the issues raised by the surveys and would benefit more from the workshops if the small group approach was dropped in favor of intensive large group "think-tank" sessions based on the principal issues raised by the Training and Transition Project to date. It was also found that many workshop participants needed information on basic CETA regulations, administrative requirements and practices, practical and political issues with which they had to deal on a daily basis. Moreover, workshop participants in rural areas tended to have a distinctive set of concerns when compared with those in urban centers. Therefore, the design of our regional workshops evolved to meet individual and group needs and the whole process was not only gratifying, but productive and efficient as well. It was an opportunity for Administrators and Employing Agencies to air views, share concerns and compare notes in a nonthreatening, nonhierarchical environment and to devise problem-solving strategies.

Special mention should be made here of the participation of Employing Agencies who, despite their minority status at the workshops, contributed very meaningfully to the discussions. For a complete summary of workshop discussions prepared and based on the notes taken at the regional workshops, see Appendix 7.

An overview of the PSE Training and Transition Project was presented at the Annual PSE Workshop held at Sun Mountain on May 19, 20, and 21, 1980. The issues identified for follow-up at the regional assessment workshops were distributed and discussed. Following this discussion, small groups were formed around those issues thought to be important (based on balloting of those present). The issues chosen were:

1) involving key individuals/organizations in the EDP process;
2) coordination of PSE programs with the labor market;
3) re-orientation of Employing Agencies and communities to the "new" CETA direction;
4) need for proactive planning and two-way communication at all levels of PSE;
5) special problems in rural areas; and
6) provision of individualized training programs.

These groups were instructed to use a simple problem-solving model/ Situation-Target-Proposal (STP) approach. The groups discussed the issues, developed a target or resolution, and designed, to varying degrees, a plan or proposal to impact the situation. The results of each group's efforts were then presented to the larger group for discussion.

The PSE Administrators and staff present at the Workshop are to be commended for the volume and quality of work turned out during the brief work sessions.

RESULTS

I. PSE Program Administrator Interviews

The most frequent type of training provided to PSE participants statewide is clerical skill training. It is almost always provided by the local community college in a classroom setting. Other traditional skill-related classroom courses provided by the community college are used frequently, e.g. accounting, data entry, business administration, mechanics, etc. The second largest type of training provided is in the social service area. The primary resource used is the privately conducted workshop or seminar. Typical workshops include grant-writing, crisis intervention, communication skills, counseling, and problem-solving. Workshops related to a particular social service delivery system are also beginning to be used more frequently, e.g. family planning, women's shelters, alcohol treatment, etc. Urban areas need this type of training much more frequently than rural areas. Assertiveness training, values clarification, and personal awareness workshops are also popular now, although PSE Administrators are split evenly when it comes to evaluating the effectiveness of such training. Other training areas that are beginning to be explored with considerable success are English as a second language, health services, G.E.D, basic adult education, and basic survival skills such as financial planning. A new area of training that is getting considerable attention by Prime Sponsors and Program Agents is job search, job clubs, orientation to the world of work, work readiness skills, and career planning. Most jurisdictions are planning on continuing job search training using instructors who are familiar with local job market conditions and training resources. It is generally thought that the Title II-D PSE participant will benefit greatly from such training.

The primary training resource being tapped statewide is the community college. Such training includes the normal day and evening classes found in the community college catalog; however, in some cases special workshops and courses are being designed exclusively to meet generic PSE participant skill training needs. Other training resources being utilized (although comparatively infrequently) include vocational-technical schools; privately run workshops; business schools; four-year colleges and universities; private industry-sponsored training, such as IBM and Wang; universities "without walls", such as City College and Antioch; and, to a very limited extent, correspondence courses.

The increasing emphasis on training in PSE is beginning to act as a catalyst for creating formal linkages between CETA and the training/education delivery community. The Commission on Vocational Education, community college districts, and technical schools are becoming increasingly involved in the planning and delivery of PSE training services. Most jurisdictions feel that cooperative and coordinated efforts between CETA and local providers of skills training are essential for the success of the PSE Title II-D training effort.

There is a wide variety of training authorization processes and mechanisms being utilized by the various Prime Sponsors and Program Agents. In most cases, the training request may be initiated by the participant, the Employing Agency supervisor, the counselor and/or the training coordinator.

Approval is usually given if the training is related to the Employability Development Plan (EDP) or the Transition Action Plan. However, one jurisdiction would only approve training that is directly related to the training needs of the current PSE placement. The individuals authorized to approve training varied widely among Prime Sponsors, from the counselor or training coordinator to final approval by the Program Administrator only. Complex and rigid training approval procedures are often an artifact of the pre-April, 1979, CETA/PSE programs where training was primarily viewed as a "frill" that could be easily abused and was a very low priority item to allocate limited project funds to.

The current skill training provided to PSE participants is often not related to identified labor market needs. While the training may be "good" for the participants and/or consistent with their EDP, it is not necessarily tied to an identified and realistic future employment opportunity. Most administrators agree that there is a strong need to develop and encourage training that matches the participant needs and interest to the labor market. Increased attention is also being given to gearing training efforts to transitioning to the private sector.

Considerable disagreement was found regarding the value of the Employment Development Planning (EDP) requirement of the new regulations. Opinion ranged from "It's a total waste of time" to It's the best thing to happen to PSE in years". It was generally agreed that as a paperwork requirement the EDP is worthless. It must be thought of and used as an employment counseling tool. It is the "process" of Employment Development Planning that is important. There is strong agreement that an interactive approach must be taken to the planning process that includes the participant, PSE counselor, supervisor, training coordinator, job developer, and labor market specialist. The major barrier to this approach is a lack of staff and funds at the program operator level to carry out the process. It is not a cheap program and currently must be paid for out of limited administrative funds. Several additional problems impact the implementation of the EDP as envisioned in the regulations. It is assumed that each participant possesses a definative "career goal". In reality, most participants do not have such a goal (in fact, neither do most people in the general population) and, if they do have a goal, it changes frequently. Consequently, there is often an artificial, contrived plan created just to satisfy the paperwork requirement. Often participants are asked to come up with their "career goal" during a short intake interview. The direction of their whole training plan will depend on this decision. For this reason, many jurisdictions are considering placing considerable emphasis on providing sophisticated up-front career assessment services. Frequently, the PSE placement is not consistent with the long-range career plan, setting up a conflict between the training needs of the PSE placement and the training needs of the targeted placement which is increasingly in the private sector.

About one-third of the Program Administrators interviewed reported that they will not be able to meet the 15% training requirement in PSE Title II-D, particularly in rural areas. They felt they could meet the requirement by approving any type of training request regardless of suitability, and by purchasing large, expensive generic training programs. However, they felt that this would constitute a padding of training expenditures, which was strongly opposed by all Administrators interviewed.

It was generally concluded that state, city and county governments were the most successful agencies in transitioning PSE participants. With a few exceptions, local school districts were also very successful. A consistent finding was that the private nonprofits have difficulties transitioning, unless they happen to have a reliable funding source other than CETA. For this reason, one jurisdiction would not allow CETA funds to be used for start-up of private nonprofit agencies and required no more than 25% of staff be funded by CETA.

Availability of jobs and funds were felt to be the major factors contributing to high transition rates. Other positive factors identified were size of agency, presence of good personnel and management systems, degree of prior commitment to transitioning, and presence and quality of OJT. Training was generally viewed as helpful, but not the major factor in transitioning. One Program Administrator, however, felt the availability of training, support services, and client advocacy were the key to transitioning. Four jurisdictions felt that training was generally not a factor at all in transitioning.

The occupational group most often successfully transitioned was clerical. This was a consistent finding in all jurisdictions. Other occupational groupings where success was reported in transitioning are:

Public Health Service position
Para-professional social services (State, City, County)
Maintenance/labor
Trades
Non-apprentice skilled occupations (technical
Law enforcement
Non-social service positions in state government (e.g. transportation)
Administrative

The single most difficult new regulation the PSE Administrators are trying to adjust to is the Average Annual Wage restriction. The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act requires that PSE job holders' wages meet a local Average Annual Wage indexed above or below the national average ($7,200.00 annually in FY 79). The Average Annual Wage is indexed depending on how local unsubsidized wages compare to the national average. Many potential Employing Agencies have left the program as a result. Administrators report that some large employers are questioning their involvement in PSE and support from organized labor is threatened because CETA compensation is so far out of alignment with standard wage scales.

Developing participant employability is particularly difficult in rural areas due to a general lack of training resources, the time and cost involved in transporting participants to available training sites, and real problems in developing unsubsidized placements for transition in a local economy that has an extremely high rate of unemployment. Locating and developing PSE placements is becoming increasingly difficult due to a lack of public agencies located outside urban areas. It was suggested that skill training for rural areas be geared to the labor needs of other markets; however, many potential PSE participants have little desire to leave their home districts. This approach has many controversial social and economic

impacts that must be addressed. However, some innovative approaches are being attempted. Community colleges have begun outreach efforts in some areas. For the most part, basic education is being provided. "Workshops on Wheels" is an effort to get specific training to rural areas where there are sufficient numbers of students. Rural area bookmobiles may provide not only books, but also an education specialist to determine current skill levels and deliver some basic adult education. Traveling job readiness and employability development workshops have been used successfully in rural areas.

Other possible future directions suggested were assessing local resources and working cooperatively with available educational institutions to set up training,or hiring staff persons within Employing Agencies to provide training for PSE participants. It was stressed that there are individuals in rural areas who could provide training in a tutorial approach. They would need to be trained and certified as instructors. Structured training plans could be developed to assure consistency of the training provided. A competency-based exam could be administered and credit arranged through the community college system. Self-paced learning labs and video-tape set-ups may also be useful tools.

The most common comments made during our interviews concerned the problems originating from past perceptions and practices of the CETA program. Many Employing Agencies have come to rely upon CETA to fund staff. This situation has its roots in the Emergency Employment Act of 1970 and earlier CETA programs. Many employers tend to view CETA participants more as employees than as trainees. This perception is further complicated by the expanding number of private nonprofit and local governmental units experiencing severe budget restrictions and loss of traditional staff funding. As a result, tremendous political pressure has come to bear on Prime Sponsors and Program Agents to fund programs that have little chance for transition and a low commitment to training.

There has been a change in emphasis in CETA. Today, the number one priority is clearly that of serving the needs of participants, the traditional needs of the Employing Agency being secondary. Employing Agencies may not be receiving the type of participant they have become accustomed to. The "new" participant is in need of training; employers viewing CETA participants solely as full-time staff have been hard-pressed to provide release time to meet training needs. Often there is a conflict between the training needs of the PSE placement and the type of training that leads to unsubsidized employment, e.g. skills targeted at the private job market and non-traditional occupations for women.

It is difficult to convince Employing Agencies that they can serve the broader interests of the community by enhancing the employability of participants and still fulfill their staffing needs.

A number of innovative approaches to PSE are being considered and developed throughout the state. Several Program Administrators felt strongly that providing adequate child care programs was critical to the success of CETA, particularly in light of the Average Annual Wage and supplementation restrictions. Participant group problem-solving and the creation of support groups were also viewed as valuable services. In-depth counseling was identified as useful. Several people stressed that there is an emerging need

for front-end services which tend to enhance employability and presentability, such as the provision of dental care, clothing allowances, training in grooming and etiquette, membership in Weight Watchers, and image-building workshops.

Apprenticeship-type programs using instructors from private industry geared to developing generic skills useful in a predetermined high demand job classification need to be developed.

It was generally suggested that a systems approach be taken to training, beginning with an analysis of the labor market that identifies the skills and competencies that will result in employment. An assessment should be made of the participant's interests and skills. A short- and long-range career plan should be developed, including career planning, values clarification, and image-building efforts. A strong action planning component is necessary that specifies support services and training that are directly related to the EDP. Skill acquisition must be emphasized. A key factor for success would be the availability of a strong training coordinator, advocate or counselor who has a limited caseload and has become intimately familiar with the needs of the participants and the agencies. Many jurisdictions feel that they will have success using a Request-for-Proposal approach that strongly emphasizes training. Advertising for available PSE jobs referencing the training aspect and even including a syllabus may result in changing expectations and successful recruiting. Strong public relations efforts and the marketing of the CETA concept will be necessary to change community and potential Employing Agency attitudes.

II. Employing Agency Survey

(A total of 418 responded out of 607 surveyed. Urban agencies accounted for 52% of the total response; rural agencies 48%. 22% had two funding sources.)

A signficant majority of Employing Agencies (EA's) are satisfied with the amount of information, the number of visits, and the assistance received from CETA/PSE. Opinion is divided equally on the value of an agency orientation meeting prior to receiving a placement.

Close to two-thirds of EA's felt that paperwork requirements did not create unnecessary burdens for their staff. The number of suggestions for elimination of paperwork were minimal, with the two most frequent suggestions being elimination of duplication of reports and confusing reimbursement procedures.

While 61% felt they received consistent answers when calling the CETA office, a significant minority (30%) felt the opposite.

Opinion was equally divided regarding the change in regulations requiring more training having a net benefit effect for participants. However, when the "uncertain" category is combined with the "no" responses, almost 70% of EA's are represented. This would indicate that it is either too early to tell or that generally EA's feel ambiguous regarding the effect on participants of the regulation changes.

EA's generally reported little problem in scheduling release time for training. Their preference was for release time to be planned in advance and scheduled "one-half day periodically". Only 12% felt participants should attend training "on their own time". Similarly, the vast majority (89%) allowed release time for job search.

Over half of the EA's said they were interested in using "job sharing" to allow for coverage of the job while training occurred. A significant minority were uncertain regarding use of job sharing (25%).

The use of agency staff to provide individualized instruction for their PSE participants was favored by 72% of the EA's, with only 9% responding negatively.

A "how to conduct training" workshop was viewed as beneficial by 44% of the EA's, with 29% saying no and 27% uncertain. This, coupled with a 39% yes response to the question "Should agencies provide participant training using CETA resources?", provides some justification for providing EA's with assistance in planning and conducting training. However, it should be noted that 23% felt agencies should not conduct training and 38% were uncertain.

EA's attitudes toward training are generally positive; 76% felt training is helpful in the placement of participants. Only 4% felt it was not and 20% were uncertain.

Suggestions for improving training seemed to cluster around several main themes: 1) more training which is job-related, consistent with area school offerings, and consistent with career goals; and 2) individualized training which is skill-oriented and specific to the type of placements agencies have. More training money was mentioned. Also, better coordination, publicity, and monitoring of progress toward training goals were mentioned.

A significant trend emerged in response to the questions on EDP's and Transition Planning. Only 27% said they became actively involved in developing a written plan for training and transition. On the other hand, some 59% stated they did not become involved in transition planning; the remainder were uncertain as to their role.

Consistently, only 28% stated they are involved in updating the EDP. Also, 26% felt EDP's did <u>not</u> help participants get non-CETA jobs. 23% said yes, EDP's do help participants get non-CETA jobs, with the largest response (50%) stating they were uncertain about the help EDP's give participants.

EA's provide some of the training recommended in the Transition Plan (44%). Only 18% said they did not provide any training, while 43% were uncertain.

Many agencies (54%) stated their PSE supervisors could use additional training.

Only 41% of responding agencies indicated that barriers preventing transition existed. Those who felt there were no barriers to transition represented 49% of the total. The most overwhelming barrier cited was, of course, money (budget).

When combined with other responses which were similar (e.g. few openings), this response accounted for 85% of the total response. Other barriers cited included: civil service rules and union contracts; entry level requirements too high; poor quality participants; and competition for openings.

When asked how transition could be promoted, again "more money" led as the favored response. Increased funding, more openings, higher salaries accounted for two-thirds of the remarks. Additional ways transition could be promoted included: publicizing job openings, more job-related training, subsidized transition, economic development of community, and more training.

The vast majority felt that PSE employees receiving supportive services and training did not cause morale or other staff problems. Only 17% felt problems were caused.

The effect of the April 1, 1979, change in regulations on EA's is varied. Of the comments received, 137 or 23% said their participation in CETA was reduced. Poor quality participants were cited by 17%. 12% stated their participation ended as a result of the changes. Only 4% said their participation increased. Other comments included: difficult to get referrals; salary limit problems; salaries too low; restricted professional positions; more release time; poor morale; more paperwork; and more supervision required.

In response to the question about supplementing the maximum annual salary if allowed, 35% said they would, 21% said they would not, while the largest category (44%) were uncertain.

PSE was viewed as a critical funding source by about half the agencies (44%), while 41% viewed PSE funding as not critical. 15% were uncertain.

Supportive services to participants were viewed as sufficient by 47%, while 19% felt they were not sufficient. The uncertain group accounted for 34% of the total.

Designating certain "trainee" positions within their organizations which could be refilled when a participant was trained and transitioned appears to get a healthy nod of approval, as 71% stated they would be willing to negotiate such a procedure. Only 7% said they would not be interested in setting up such trainee positions. 22% were uncertain.

Similarly, 73% stated they would continue to participate in PSE. Only 7% said they would not continue participation, while 20% were uncertain. Reasons for not participating clustered around the issue of wages. Also listed were: poor quality participants, paperwork, union problems, no positions, and difficulty in meeting the 50% transition requirement.

Of those who said they would continue to participate in PSE, the job categories cited for future use included: human/health services (25%); clerical (29%); maintenance/custodial (14%); education (10%); technical (4%); public works, conservation, parks, public safety, administration, planning, drivers, and food services (19%).

III. PSE Participant Survey

Three hundred fifteen (48%) of the PSE Title II-D and Title VI participants sampled responded to the survey. 56% of those participants responding characterized their geographic locations as urban and 44% were rural.

Most PSE participants (64%) reported that they received an orientation to CETA in the first few weeks of the PSE placement. The remainder were uncertain or did not receive an orientation.

Only 40% stated that they were involved in writing a plan for their training and development (an EDP). An unexpectedly high number of the participants (52%) reported that they were not involved in writing such a plan. Interestingly, 44% thought that their current Employability Development Plan was realistic, with the remainder stating no or undecided. Exactly one-third of the respondents said their plan was updated on a regular basis.

Almost 80% of the participants reported that their employer allowed time off during working hours for them to attend training. But only 59% reported having actually attended classroom training. A significant number (40%) have not attended any classroom training. The average number of classes per participant is 2, with a range from 0 to 14. The majority (62%) feel that they need more training, while only 22% want no more training. Over half (57%) think that the training they have received so far has helped them in their current CETA job. A positive attitude toward training by participants was evidenced by the 82% who responded affirmatively to the question "Do you think getting training increases your chances of finding a permanent job?" However, only 59% reported that the training they have received to date will help them get a permanent job. Most participants state that they are able to locate the training courses they need. When asked what type of training they had received, respondents indicated: 46% workshops/seminars; 40% training conducted by their employer; 33% community college; 18% vocational school classes; and 2% other.

Specific job/career related skill acquisition was the most popular response to the question "What additional training do you need to help find a permanent job?" The second most popular response was clerical training followed by higher education or degree course work. Other responses in order of popularity are: OJT; basic communication skills (reading, writing, etc.); job finding/career planning; more training (classes) in general; business/accounting; self-improvement; vocational education; internship; apprenticeship; and special education.

Less than half of the participants felt that the career counseling they had received was helpful, 32% felt it was not helpful, and 27% were uncertain or did not respond. A significant majority (63%) indicated that they did not receive supportive services such as transportation, child care, tools, etc. from CETA.

A number of different responses were elicited from the open-ended question "What problems do you feel may keep you from being successful on your current CETA job?" The responses were clustered in the following way:

The most frequent was lack of OJT or adequate training, closely followed by inadequate pay and lack of authority or responsibility. Various types of interpersonal conflicts with supervisors were reported. Prospects for continued funding and no where to transition to were also popular responses. Lack of time for job search and training and lack of transportation were each mentioned seven times.

Responses were split evenly between yes and no to the question "Has your agency talked with you about moving into a regular job after your CETA funding runs out?" Only 34% said that they had received assistance in job search and placement. Opinion was evenly split as to the value of that assistance. Less than one-quarter of the participants reported that their supervisor did not allow time off during working hours to look for work and 20% were uncertain about getting release time or did not respond. However, 58% did receive time away from work for job search.

When asked "What assistance do you need to help get a permanent job?", by far the most common cluster of answers indicated a need for specific, accurate job market information; it was often stressed that such information needs to be current and address the local job market conditions. More OJT was also identified as needed, as well as special training in interviewing techniques and special job placement and development services.

Participants responded in the following ways to the question "What changes would you make to improve CETA?" The most common was raise pay, followed in order by: provide more timely, better CETA orientation; build transition plans into CETA programs; provide more money for and increase training and support services; institute required training; and attempt to attract better qualified participants.

When asked what they wanted to do when they left CETA, 74% said they would look for a job or start a new job already lined up. 31% wanted to return to school, while only 6% wanted to "take some time off" or collect unemployment.

The average length of time respondents were unemployed before entering CETA was 10.76 months (this mean was adjusted to compensate for an unusually high standard deviation) and their average length of time in the program is 8.13 months.

V. Workshops

For a complete summary of the discussions that took place at the seven regional workshops organized by the six major issue categories raised during the survey phase, please refer to Appendix 7.

At the conclusion of each workshop a list of issues was drawn up that represented the most important areas discussed during the analysis of the survey data. These issues were refined, eliminated, and adjusted. Finally, a concensus opinion was solicited that these were indeed the salient issues raised that deserved follow-up at either local, state, or federal levels. The following is a list of those issues. Please note that similar issues raised at more than one workshop are clustered together.

1. Need for Full-time Training Coordinator/Employment Counselor Staff

   - Need for full-time professional staff to provide counseling and training for participants in job readiness skills.
   - Need for staff to coordinate and set up individualized skill training using local resources.
   - Lack of full-time staff and budget to do adequate job of developing and following up on EDP (the process, not the form).

2. Average Annual Wage

   - The Average Annual Wage is a barrier to transition for the large employer. It is hard for the PSE participant to exist on the Average Annual Wage.
   - The Average Annual Wage is causing large employers and those with union contracts to leave CETA. Also causes inequities in personnel systems.
   - Need to do follow-up with congressional delegation and Department of Labor on the issue of the Average Annual Wage. The differences between counties make it particularly difficult for large state employers who cut across counties and use funds from many different primes.
   - Differences and inequities in the Average Annual Wage (by driving 150 miles, you can raise pay $200).

3. Involving Key Individuals/Organizations in the EDP Process

   - Get the Employing Agency, supervisor, administrator and the participant more involved in the EDP process.
   - Make EDP's more realistic by more on-site visits with the participant and Employing Agency supervisor.
   - Need to provide training which is consistent with the intent of CETA/PSE, the career and job skill goals of the participant and the needs of the employer by better coordination among actors.
   - Improve and involve key people in the EDP process.
   - Inform and involve Employing Agencies in the EDP process.

4. Coordination of PSE Training Programs with Labor Market

- Identify occupational areas (through labor market analysis) which are: 1) hard to fill/high demand; 2) can be trained for within 18 months; 3) either public or private.
- Need to provide labor market analysis to staff who are developing EDP's.

5. Re-Orientation of Employing Agencies and Community to "New Directions" in CETA

- Need to develop a one-week Employing Agency orientation to re-educate agencies.
- Need to re-orient Employing Agencies, training institutions, and participants to new CETA program needs.

6. Need for "Front-End" Training and Assessment Programs

- Provide "front-end" job-ready training that is tied to a targeted job description.
- Develop and implement a front-end "two-week" assessment, orientation, job readiness and training program.
- Develop strong front-end assessment program that relates participant goals with labor market analysis.
- Design and provide generic skill training up front.

7. Need for Proactive Planning and Two-Way Communication at All Levels of PSE

- Need to involve employers in planning for PSE priorities and identifying future needs of public employers (using PIC model).
- Develop a method to get Employing Agencies together with PSE staff to solve mutual problems and plan future programs.
- Lack of two-way communication between Employing Agencies and Primes/Program Agents.
- Need for two-way communicaion and proactive planning at all levels of PSE from Department of Labor to deliverers of direct services.
- Problem with lack of planning time at JSC level for developing and implementing innovative training programs (need at least four months lead time).

8. Lack of Credibility of CETA/PSE Due to Inconsistencies and Constant Changes

- Inconsistency (caused by political factors in PSE program directions causes many difficulties for Primes/Program Agents and Employing Agencies, e.g. Title VI freeze on and off; changing funding levels in the middle of the fiscal year.
- Problem of credibility due to "politicalization" of CETA, e.g. changing regulations, directions, freezes.
- Low credibility of CETA/PSE staff in community due to constant changes.
- How to change the "stigma" attached to CETA.

9. Coordination and Cooperation Among CETA Titles

- Need to coordinate delivery of services among titles and other programs of CETA.
- How to increase coordination and cooperation among titles.

10. Provision of In-Service Training to CETA/PSE Staff

- Need to develop and provide professional employment counselor training programs geared to the needs of counselors working with PSE clients.
- Provide professional training for those who do and are responsible for EDP's.

11. Provision of Individualized Training Programs

- Develop method to provide individualized instruction using "structured training plan" provided by Employing Agency staff with CETA paying for instructors.
- Use tutors (certified by Vocational Education or community college district)to provide rural area training to PSE participants.

12. Special Problem in Rural Areas

- PSE is primarily an employment program as there are few or no local jobs for which to train participants.

13. Need to Establish Child Care Programs Staffed and Funded by PSE to Meet the Needs of Participants on Low Wages

14. Need to Simplify Verification and Re-Verification of Eligibility

15. Large Employer with Automated Accounting System Cannot Adjust to Meet the Complex and Varying Demands of CETA Reporting Need Assistance

16. Develop and Encourage Part-time Placement/Part-time Training Programs Tandem Employment

VI. Annual PSE Workshop

The results of the seven regional workshops were discussed at the Annual PSE Workshop. Six important issues were chosen to be addressed in a small group problem-solving mode. Each group was asked to describe the issue as it is currently perceived (situation), then they were to establish a goal or ideal state regarding this issue (target). Next, an action plan or series of proposals was to be developed that would help the affected individual/organizations reach the target (plan). The results of the "task group" process are listed as follows by the issue title:

1. Involving Key Individuals/Organizations in the EDP Process

Situation: The EDP is not always being used appropriately. It can become merely a paperwork task rather than a planning tool. There is a lack of coordination among the people who should be involved in the EDP process (participant, supervisor, counselor, and training coordinator).

Target: Coordination of the Employing Agency, Prime Sponsor staff, and participant in the EDP. Viewing this from both the employer's point of view (what is needed for transition to an unsubsidized job) and from the participant's needs for the current job and the "career goal". Merge these two into an agreement.

Plan: Meet with employers to determine what is needed.

Incorporate a market analysis into transition planning.

Develop EDP's which begin with the original assessment of participants. Program must be geared to individual needs based upon their present social, intellectual, and material situation; employability; and upon the realities of the job market.

2. Coordination of PSE Training with the Labor Market Situation

Situation: We do not have adequate information on "hard to fill/high demand" occupations. Current resources include occupation employment survey and other projects "in the wind" involving the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee and private schools. We need a committee of Primes to define needs.

Target: Adequate responsive system developed to provide information about occupational needs and trends in various geographic locations.

Plan: Do a survey to determine which jobs are not "high turnover" and can be trained for in 18 months, when, and where they are located.

Develop a committee to write a work plan that will define survey outcomes and format. Contract with a private, objective organization to conduct the survey and do follow-up. Coordinate Primes and Governor's Grant to fund the survey. Willing to commit $250,000 in FY 80-81, with implementation to follow in FY 82. Concentrate on Title II-D with an awareness of Title VI activity coordination.

3. Re-orientation of Employing Agencies and Community to "New" CETA Directions

Situation: Employing Agencies frequently view CETA as a funding source for staff positions without fully understanding the training requirements of the "new" PSE Title II-D.

Target: Increased knowledge and awareness of PSE programs, policies, and issues on the part of employers and the community.

Plan: Options to reach target:

Develop a "pre-digested" summary describing current or future PSE activities and distribute monthly.

Newsletter(s) from Prime Sponsors.

Conduct workshops using specific experts to tell "how to" in matters of accounting, fiscal records, grant writing, etc. for current and potential employers.

Monthly breakfast meetings with employers.

One-on-one technical assistance to Employing Agencies from Prime Sponsor/Program Agent.

Develop an "employer advocacy" approach within the Primes.

Put together and market a "Mini Technical Assistance Team" to serve employers or potential employers.

Provide information to employing agencies from internal monitoring units (IMU).

Incorporate monitoring into the ongoing management system.

4. Need for Proactive Planning and Two-Way Communication at All Levels of CETA
and
Lack of Credibility of CETA/PSE Due to Inconsistencies and Constant Changes

Situation: Changes occur rapidly, frequently without an opportunity for two-way interchange among those affected by the changes. The politicalization of CETA has produced a feeling of "we don't want to become lion's meat" when explaining the vast changes to employers, participants and the community.

Target: A system which incorporates input from all Primes and Program Agents prior to changes being made in regulations.

Plan: Need more technical assistance from Department of Labor.

Need a "model planning cycle" to serve as a method for systematically involving Primes in the decision-making process.

Launch a public relations campaign to deal with the problems of credibility within the community.

Develop a network among Primes and Program Agents to provide direct input to Department of Labor.

Need a more effective communication system among Primes.

Need more conferences of this kind designed to share information and facilitate professional growth incorporating time for similar functional groups to get together, e.g. directors, planners, counselors, training coordinators, etc.

5. Special Problems in Rural Areas

Situation: Training and transition in rural areas is difficult due to lack of resources, large distances, and inadequate job market.

Target: Get training to PSE participants and increase transition.

Plan: Increase labor market analysis beyond the county boundary.

Institute job search training to increase transition.

Incorporate non-traditional approaches to training as well as using community colleges and adult education programs.

Community colleges are good resources; some have established a CETA coordinator; training can be set up around the coordinator.

Tutorial approach to individual skill training is an untapped resource which can be used.

Assist local economic development, e.g. what could PSE do to help tourism development in Winthrop?

6. Provision of Individualized Training Programs

Situation: How do we creatively train people and allow for meeting the Average Annual Wage as a by-product?

Target: Title II-D participants, where appropriate, have individualized training plans to implement their EDP's.

Plan: Do front-end assessment upon which the individualized training plan is based.

Develop structured training plan(s) which provide incentive to employers, e.g. pay supervisors for time spent preparing and training participants.

Employers must be involved in the design.

Pay minimum wage while in training (6 months) and then pay a higher wage with increased competence (for the remainder of the 18-month placement).

RECOMMENDATIONS

After extensive review and analysis of all the data generated during the three phases of the Project, the following recommendations are offered to assist policy makers in addressing PSE regulations and directions for the future. These recommendations represent some possible approaches to the critical issues raised during this Project.

1. Expanding and Improving the Employability Development Planning Process

The key to meeting the intent of the "new" PSE Title II-D program lies with strengthening the EDP process. This process, to be effective, must be viewed by everyone involved as an extremely important, ongoing function whose goal is successful transition of the PSE participant to an unsubsidized job in the public or private sector. To accomplish this, these specific recommendations should be implemented:

- Prime Sponsors and Program Agents should involve all of the following people in the design, delivery, and updating of the EDP:
  - the participant;
  - the Employing Agency supervisor, i.e. the person who knows the participant's job and who supervises the participant on a day-to-day basis;
  - the PSE staff member(s) responsible for assisting the participant through the PSE placement and into an unsubsidized job (the counselor, training coordinator, and/or other Prime Sponsor staff).

- The EDP should include a substantial professional front-end assessment of the participant's current job readiness, skill level(s), short- and long-term job interests, past experience, education, and capability to work and attend training within the PSE placement period.

- The EDP should have a built-in feedback process which provides information to the Employing Agency supervisor, the participant, and the PSE counselor/training coordinator on the participant's progress in developing and applying skills on the job. Regular updating of the EDP shall result from this feedback of performance.

- The EDP should incorporate accurate, current job market information to assure that the transition to unsubsidized employment is possible within the 18-month limitation.

- The EDP should at minimum emphasize training for preparation for the world of work, job search techniques, and specific skill training needed for the current placement and for a specific targeted unsubsidized job.

- Sophisticated up-front career assessment services should be developed that will assist the participants in realistically choosing from a pre-selected pool of available career choices which have a high demand, as demonstrated by market analysis. A target job would be selected that not only was consistent with the participant's interest and skills but also had a high probability of placement at the end of 18 months of training and work experience. The minimum qualifications and requisite skill levels of the target job would be identified. The participant and counselor could then assess the participant's skills against those required by the target job. With the help of the training coordinator, a realistic training plan could then be developed.

- Prime Sponsors and Program Agents should allocate more staff resources to this function in an effort to bring caseloads to a reasonable level (e.g. 50:1).

- The Department of Labor and Prime Sponsors should provide high quality professional in-service training programs to local staff engaged in coordinating and implementing the EDP process. Such training should include:

    - how to conduct accurate local job market analysis;
    - employment counseling;
    - vocational testing and assessment;
    - skill assessment techniques;
    - career planning;
    - active listening;
    - values clarification;
    - training plan design;
    - competency-based evaluation strategies;
    - job search/job development.

2. Adjusting to the Average Annual Wage Limitations

Despite the numerous problems associated with the Average Annual Wage, it has effectively changed the direction of PSE. Despite experiencing many initial frustrations, PSE directors are taking a positive problem-solving approach to meeting the requirements of this regulation. The following recommendations are offered to assist Prime Sponsors and Program Agents in adjusting to the Average Annual Wage limitations:

- Large statewide employers (e.g. State government) should be allowed to compensate PSE "trainee" job classifications within the same range regardless of which county the participant is employed in, thus eliminating a threat to their future participation in PSE.

- Prime Sponsors and Program Agents should use supportive service funds creatively to assist PSE participants attempting to live on low wages in these inflationary times (e.g. child care projects, like the program in Yakima which provides child care using PSE funding and participants). Increased efforts need to be made in providing transportation assistance to and from training and work using car and van pools and other forms of public transportation.

- A fundamental shift in attitude toward supportive services is needed, viewing them as a legitimate part of the participant's plan rather than a service to be used sparingly in only the most extreme cases.

- The Primes and Program Agents should encourage model projects and demonstration grants to develop cooperative supportive service systems in the areas of child care, transportation, medical, dental and legal services.

- Flexibility should be allowed by the Department of Labor in the methods by which Primes determine Average Annual Wage levels if the Prime Sponsor is showing a "good faith" effort to meet the regulations. Corrective action and other management approaches should be exhausted by the Department of Labor before requiring "pay backs" for violations of the Average Annual Wage restriction.

- Current job restructuring efforts should be continued to allow the development of "trainee" classifications which meet the intent of the Average Annual Wage and are consistent with affected union negotiated wage scales.

3. Implementing a Proactive Planning Process in PSE

Proactive planning is a process of involving the people who must implement policy or are impacted by policy in the design of that policy before decisions are finalized. Proactive planning is not a one-time thing but must be ongoing to reap the benefits of effective utilization of the human resource within the CETA system. Increased emphasis on two-way communication is needed at all levels of PSE to assist in the implementation of proactive planning. The following recommendations are made:

- Communication networks should be strengthened between:
  - Department of Labor and Prime Sponsor/Program Agents, as well as the State Prime;
  - Prime Sponsor/Program Agent staff and Employing Agencies;
  - PSE staff and participants;
  - Employing Agency supervisors and participants.

- Problem-solving sessions among interfacing individuals and organizations such as PSE staff, Employing Agencies, Department of Labor Field Representatives, and PSE program operators should be held on a regular basis (at least quarterly) to provide information and assistance in adjusting to emerging needs and new program directions.

- Groups of professionals from Prime Sponsors and Program Agents who have similar functions should be brought together for exchange of information and problem-solving.

- Technical assistance programs should be based upon formal needs assessment studies of Prime Sponsor/Program Agent needs. Products of these technical assistance efforts should be localized to address regional concerns.

- Potential employing agencies and other sub-contractors should be involved in the planning process at the Prime Sponsor level. This can be accomplished by utilizing an interactive bidders conference prior to release of Request for Proposals (RFP's).

- In-service training programs to support major program changes should be developed by Prime Sponsors/Program Agents to assure the successful implementation of policy changes. Every major program change should include a funding provision that will result in training being provided to the individuals who implement the change.

- Workshops and/or problem-solving work sessions should be scheduled quarterly to bring together the Department of Labor, Prime Sponsor/Program Agent staff, and other resource people in an effort to assess implementation of policy, identify potential and existing problems, and develop appropriate solutions/strategies to eliminate problems.

- Currently in PSE there is a heavy emphasis on monitoring, evaluation, and the threat of sanctions being imposed. This atmosphere tends to limit creativity and innovative program development. Management principles such as mutual problem-solving, team building, cooperation, open communications, corrective action, and technical assistance should be encouraged.

- Prime Sponsor efforts at proactive planning and increased program stability could be greatly increased by implementing a two-year funding cycle for CETA/PSE.

4. Addressing Special Rural Area Training and Transition Problems

PSE programs operating in rural areas have unique problems in meeting the intent of the re-authorization. Three specific circumstances account for the majority of difficulties: 1) lack of sufficient, accessible training resources; 2) lack of available unsubsidized placements due to unfavorable economic conditions and restricted job markets; and 3) fewer

available staff and resources within the Prime Sponsor/Program Agent to cover large geographic areas. To assist rural areas in overcoming these barriers, the following recommendations are made:

- Special demonstration projects and model programs should be initiated to assess existing training resources and develop new resources such as:
  - apprenticeship programs with public sector employees;
  - apprenticeship-type programs using journeymen from labor unions to conduct skills training on the job site or in the classroom;
  - tutorials using skilled people in the community, including senior and retired citizens;
  - professional associations to provide skill training and/or referral;
  - chamber of commerce resources;
  - development of other non-traditional skills training resources.
- Traditional training and educational resources, i.e. community and four-year colleges, vocational-technical schools, business schools, and privately conducted skill training seminars and workshops should be encouraged to provide extended outreach services to isolated rural areas using cooperative approaches and funding from both the Prime and Program Agent.
- Innovative PSE demonstration projects which enhance the economic development of the rural community should be supported and funded by Prime Sponsors/Program Agents.
- In rural areas with exceptionally high unemployment, PSE Title II-D may be realistically viewed primarily as a jobs program, with their success in transition being evaluated accordingly.
- The number of full-time staff within the Job Service Centers should be increased to work with PSE in the isolated rural areas (adequate travel budgets should allow for increased field involvement).

5. Increasing Training Opportunities for PSE Participants

While most urban areas appear to have sufficient training resources at their disposal in the form of two- and four-year colleges and universities, as well as vocational-technical and business colleges and private seminars and workshops, a broader utilization of training resources and strategies can provide increased quality and quantity of training. To assist policy makers in providing training which is effective in increasing transition to unsubsidized employment, the following recommendations are offered:

- Training should be individualized and based upon a realistic EDP.

- Employing Agencies who have a prior commitment and interest in training should be recruited and selected using a Request-for-Proposal approach which requires Employing Agencies to state how they will support the training of PSE Title II-D participants.

- Special group training programs should be implemented which provide skill development in occupational areas which have a demonstrated high demand based upon current labor market analysis.

- Employing Agencies should be involved in providing formal skill training needed for the participant's current job.

- New training resources should be developed to tap the unlimited resource of labor organizations, retired citizens, community service organizations, chambers of commerce, private sector employers, professional associations, and other individuals and organizations which can provide specific job market oriented skill training.

- Training should be geared to both public and private sector job needs.

- PSE participants should also be encouraged to develop their own training resources based upon their knowledge of local resources and skills they need to secure unsubsidized employment.

- Primes/Program Agents should develop programs to provide job readiness and generic skills training prior to actual placement with an employer.

- Part-time and tandem employment placements should be increased.

- Each Prime/Program Agent should allocate at least one full-time professional training coordinator to oversee the development, implementation and evaluation of the jurisdiction's training systems.

- Training approval procedures should be simplified. Routine decision-making authority should be delegated to the training coordinator or counselor who is actually working with the participant.

- College courses used by the participants should be realistically related to their current job and/or placement in unsubsidized employment.

- Most importantly, there needs to exist a fundamentally positive attitude toward training throughout PSE from the Department of Labor, for the participant. The individuals involved in PSE must ultimately be convinced that the heavy emphasis on training makes a difference in PSE transition rates, which is, of course, the BOTTOM LINE. Demonstrated success will be the only effective method of accomplishing this. It will be several months before that kind of concrete evidence will begin to emerge from current programs being implemented.

Realistically, however, as many experienced professionals counseled us throughout the Project, in the final analysis, political and economic factors may ultimately determine the success or failure of the current programmatic efforts to address PSE training.

APPENDIX 1

Appendix 1

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF INTERVIEW GUIDE

- In your opinion, what are the major issues or problems associated with PSE training?

- Based upon your knowledge of current PSE training, what is going well? What could be improved upon? What could be eliminated?

- Do you routinely keep data on the type and frequency of training received by participants within your jurisdiction?

- Have you encountered any specific problems in meeting the new Federal guidelines requiring a certain percentage of funds allocated to training in the current fiscal year?

- Has there been an increase in requests for participant training since the new regulations came into effect on April 1, 1979?

- Please describe your process for authorizing training requests.

- What procedures within your authorization process would you recommend to other jurisdictions?

- What specific procedures would you recommend be introduced to expedite training authorization and approval?

- What types of training are most frequently requested?

- Are there certain types of training which you would like to see requested more frequently?

- Do you have a list of training resources available for your jurisdiction? Which type of training resources do you use most frequently and successfully?

- Are there certain job categories which have shown high transition rates in your jurisdiction?

- Are there certain types of employing agencies which have been successful in transitioning participants?

- What factors do you think are significant in these high transition rate agencies? How significant is training?

- How effective are existing employability plans in meeting transition goals within employing agencies?

- Do employing agencies have the resources and skills necessary to implement participant employability plans?

- What types of training programs can be effectively used in rural areas where the availability of training resources is limited?

- Are there training programs in rural areas which are currently working well?

- What supportive services appear to facilitate transition and training?

- What types of post-termination services are valuable for participants who have transitioned to unsubsidized jobs?

- Do you provide services to participants whose time of enrollment is over, but who have not been placed in unsubsidized employment? What services are valuable for this type of participant?

- Have you developed a formal Training Policy or Guidelines? If so, may we have a copy?

- Are there additional areas of interest or concern which you would like to discuss?

Employing Agency Survey Questions

- What information would be valuable for you to know from the upcoming employing agency survey?

- Can you provide us with a current list of employing agencies within your jurisdiction by address and contact person?

- Do you have employing agencies categorized by demographic characteristics such as size, function, location, etc.?

- How would you prefer to have the data summarized and reported from the employing agency survey?

Participant Survey Questions

- What 4 - 6 questions would you like to have answered by participants responding to a survey regarding PSE training.

- What do you think the return rate would be on a participant survey in your jurisdiction?

- How many participants would you like to see sampled by such a survey?

Workshop/Assessment Meeting Questions

- Who within your jurisdiction would you recommend attend a workshop designed to accomplish two goals: 1) Train agency staff to assess training needs, design training objectives and deliver training sessions; 2) Assess barriers to effective training and transition. Can you provide us with their names and addresses?

APPENDIX 2

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS SURVEY

SUMMARY

PSE Training and Transition Project
February 14, 1980

ISSUES

-I-

EMPLOYER PERCEPTIONS

Perhaps the most pervasive comment made during our interviews concerned the problems originating from past perceptions and practices. Many employing agencies have come to rely upon CETA to fund staff. This situation has its roots in EEA and earlier CETA programs. Many employers tend to view CETA participants more as employees than as trainees. This perception is further complicated by two factors which have combined to exert tremendous political, social and economic pressure on CETA, particularly at the program operator level: 1) The rise in the number of unemployed persons with degrees in the social sciences; 2) The expanding number of private, non-profits and local governmental units experiencing severe budget restrictions and loss of traditional staff funding.

There has been a change in emphasis in CETA. Today, the number one priority is clearly that of serving the needs of participants, the traditional needs of the employing agency being secondary. Employing agencies may not be receiving the type of participant they have become accustomed to. The "new" participant is in need of training; employers viewing CETA participants solely as full-time staff have been hard-pressed to provide release time to meet training needs. Often there is a conflict between the training needs of the PSE placement and the type of training that leads to unsubsidized employment, e.g., skills targeted at the private job market and non-traditional occupations for women.

It is difficult to convince employing agencies that they can serve the broader interests of the community by enhancing the employability of participants and still fulfill their staffing needs.

-II-

PARTICIPANT ATTITUDES

Participants who need training frequently do not want it. They either do not see the value of attending classroom training or may not be interested in training for their current job, there being an often unexpressed conflict between their short-range and long-range career goals. Attending community college courses or other training is superfluous for participants who view their PSE placement as a stop-gap.

Participants may not know what type of training is appropriate for them. They may not be familiar with the practice of setting career goals. They need to learn how to serve as their own advocates in meeting their short-range and long-range goals.

Participants may lack basic, personal qualities needed to heighten employability, such as accurate self-awareness/self-appraisal, self-respect, rudimentary etiquette and personal hygiene.

-III-

AVERAGE ANNUAL WAGE RESTRICTIONS

With the majority of their program dollars committed to salaries, program administrators have had difficulty providing funds for training. This factor and the average annual wage restriction has forced many jurisdictions to lay-off "old " participants and start from scratch. This is further necessitated by the reduction of Title VI funds in response to lower reported unemplyment.

The average annual wage restriction impairs the competitiveness of the employing agency with the low end of the casual labor market and various welfare programs, both of which syphon off potential participants. The wage restriction has also shut out certain large employers and has alienated organized labor because CETA compensation is so far out of alignment with standard wage scales.

-IV-

15% - 20% TRAINING REQUIREMENT

Several jurisdictions report that training has always been a central part of their program and have had no problem meeting the minimum percentages. They attribute their success to placing a high priority on participant needs and having a low client/counselor ratio.

About one-third of the program administrators we interviewed are not going to be able to meet the 15%-20% requirement. They could, of course appear to meet them by approving any type of training request regardless of suitability. However, there is widespread sentiment against padding training expenditures. Many administrators feel that there is a need for further attenuation of the present phasing-in period adjusted to local conditions and participants' unique career or employment needs.

-V-

REGULATIONS

CETA regulations are complex, cumbersome and rigid in their categorization. They tend to stiffle creativity in problem-solving and make it difficult to design solutions to local problems.

A further complication is transferability and coordination among CETA titles. The community at large, participants and employing agencies have a difficult time understanding that CETA is not a single entity, but a multitude of titles designed specifically to meet certain needs.

Difficultly in getting timely interpretations is also an issue. One jurisdiction commented that having to obtain permission for out-of-state travel to attend training was an added burden.

-VI-

ACCOUNTING AND ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS

Increased paperwork to prove attendence and to meet recording requirements is a major problem. Additional staff has been required in some cases.

-VII-

LONG - RANGE PLANNING

The training provided PSE participants is not often tied to identified labor market needs. While the training may be good for the participant and/or their employing agency, it is not tied to an identified future employment opportunity. There is a very definite need to develop innovative training which matches the needs of participants with the labor market. Cooperative education programs which provide this match-up and are responsive to CETA participant needs are just now being developed.

-VIII-

EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

EDPs were one of the most controversial subject raised during our interviews. Opinion ranged from: "It is a total waste of time!" to "It's the best thing to happen to CETA in years!" Several people indicated that it is too early to tell, that the concept needs further testing for validation. There was general agreement that EDPs must be more than just another form to be filled out.

Almost every jurisdiction has revised and expanded the basic EDP document to include specific actions regarding training and supportive services. Other innovations include a Performance Report that updates the EDP quarterly.

There exists a very strong feeling that an interactive approach must be taken to the Employment Development Planning process that includes the participant, PSE counselor, supervisor and, in some cases, the training coordinator. It is a mistake to rely solely on the employing agency for development and delivery of Action Plan components. The employing agencies have neither the resources nor often the depth of interest in participants to be effective in implementing EDPs. It was reported that the PSE placement is often not consistent with the participants' long-range goals. Successful transition planning must include skill development consistent with long-range career goals even if the target placement is in the private sector.

-IX-

TRANSITION

It was generally concluded that State, City and County governments were the most successful agencies in transitioning PSE participants. With a few exceptions, local school districts were also very successful. A consistant finding was that private, non-profits have difficulties transitioning, unless they happen to have a reliable funding source other than CETA. For this reason, one jurisdiction would not allow CETA funds to be used for start-up of PNPs and required that no more than 25% of staff be funded by CETA.

Availability of jobs and funds were felt to be the major factor contrib-

uting to high transition rates. Other positive factors were size of agency, presence of effective personnel and management systems, degree of prior committment to transitioning, presence and quality of OJT. Training generally was viewed as helpful, but not the major factor in transitioning. One program administrator, however, felt that the availability of training, support services and client advocacy was the key to transitioning. Four jurisdictions felt that training was generally not a factor at all in transitioning. It was suggested that a formal longitudinal study be conducted to determine what factors relate to transitioning.

The occupational group most often successfully transitioned was clerical. This was a consistant finding. Other occupational groupings where success was reported are: public health services, para-professional social services(state, county, city), maintenance/labor(varies with economic cycle), the trades, non-apprentice skilled occupations(technical), law enforcement, non-social service positions in state government(e.g. transportation), and administration.

-X-

RURAL AREAS

Developing participant employability is difficult in rural areas due to a general lack of training resources and the time and cost involved in transporting participants to available training sites.

In those rural areas with an agrarian economy, the problems for PSE are complicated by several additional factors. The Average Annual Wage has made it difficult for PSE to compete with seasonal agricultural jobs and unemployment compensation in the off-season. In addition, locating and developing PSE placements is becoming increasingly difficult due to a lack of public agencies located outside urban areas. Real problems exist in finding placements in a local economy that traditionally has high rates of unemployment. It was suggested that skill training for rural areas be geared to the labor needs of other markets, however, many potential PSE participants have little desire to leave their home districts. This issue deserves further study.

There are some bright spots in this somewhat gloomy picture of the rural areas. Community colleges have begun out-reach efforts in some areas. For the most part, basic education is being provided. "Workshops on Wheels" is an effort to get specific training to rural areas where there are sufficient numbers of students. Bookmobiles provide not only books, but also a reading specialist to determine current skill levels and administer some adult education. Job readiness and employability development workshops have been used successfully in rural areas.

Among possible future directions: Assessing local resources and working cooperatively with available educational institutions to set-up training; Hiring staff persons or supervisors within employing agencies to provide classroom training for groups of PSE participants in rural areas. It was stressed that there are individuals in rural areas who can provide training. These individuals need institutional support if they are to train. Self-paced learning labs and video tape set-ups may be useful tools.

-XI-

SUPPORTIVE AND POST-TERMINATION SERVICES

Some administrators felt that supportive services are extremely valuable and provide the underpinning upon which participants can build up their skills via outside and on-the-job training. Transportation to and from work sites and training sites is a valuable, if not critical, service in the first month of employment. The same is true for supplying uniforms, tools and safety equipment.

However, the value of these supportive services was questioned. Administrators generally felt that these services might be valuable, but that they are not a necessity. They were viewed as an area for potential abuse and at least one person felt they might encourage a dependency relationship with government.

Several program administrators felt strongly that providing adequate child care was critical to the success of CETA, particularly in light of the Annual Average Wage and supplementation restrictions. Group problem-solving and the creation of support groups were viewed as valuable services. In-depth counseling was also identified as useful. Several people stressed that there is an emerging need for those services which tend to enhance employability and presentability such as the provision of: dental care, clothing allowances, training in grooming and etiguette, membership in Weightwatchers, image-building workshops.

Post-termination services for CETA participants who have not transitioned were provided by most jurisdictions. Normally, the type of services provided included job search, job placement and referral to other agencies. Job-finding clubs were seen as valuable for this type of client, although at least one jurisdiction had a negative experience requiring participants to attend these clubs. Counseling, transpostation for job search, moving expenses and other supportive services are also provided to aid these participants in placement.

A few program administrators questioned the value of post-termination services and stressed that there must be a cut-off somewhere. In fact, the majority of program administrators felt that these services for the positively transitioned individual were not useful or at least of questionable value as a priority. A minority felt that the services were useful and provided a stabilizing influence during the first 30 to 60 days on the job. The type of services provided include: uniforms, G.E.D., licenses, counseling, daycare assistance, tools and access to support groups.

TRAINING PRACTICES

I. TYPES OF TRAINING REQUESTED

Clerical and skill-related training were the most frequent types requested statewide. An emerging need is to provide participants with basic survival competencies. Seminars, workshops, as well as classroom courses, are being used for social service training. Assertiveness and personal awareness workshops are popular now, although considerable disagreement exists as to their value. Some use is being made of computer training. Other training areas that have been explored with some success are: health services, English as a second language, G.E.D. and basic adult education, job finding, orientation to the world of work/work readiness skills. Training content seems to break up into two important areas: That which focuses on specific, definable work skills and that which focuses on the basic preparedness of the individual to command a job situation--the participant's personal qualities.

II. DELIVERY

The availability of CETA funding directly earmarked for training has, in some instances, acted as a catalyst to create formal linkages between CETA and local community colleges and technical schools.

While most jurisdictions do not have formal training directories listing available resources, everyone interviewed seemed to be familiar with the training available in their area. The primary resource being tapped statewide is the community college. This includes not only day and evening classes, but also special workshops. Privately-run workshops, vocational-technical schools, private business schools, private industry-sponsored training, such as IBM and WANG, and some four-year colleges and universities are also being utilized.

Special class group projects have been successfully initiated that use instructors directly funded by PSE such as the weatherization programs. There is some experimentation with and consideration being given to putting participants into full-time training prior to their PSE placement.

III. APPROVAL PROCEDURES

There is a wide range of training approval procedures being used, from a simple process of just a few easy steps to a more complex approach, including final approval by the Program Administrator. Even though the approaches varied, administrators were quite satisfied with the systems they have developed.

In most cases, training may be initiated by the participant, the supervisor, the counselor and the training coordinator. Approval is usually given if the training is related to the EDP or Action Plan. One of the jurisdictions would only approve training that is directly related to the PSE placement.

IV. RECORD-KEEPING

The majority of program administrators record training in the participants' files. One system uses a chronological log which records the approval date, course ending date, billing date and the actual payment date. Several jurisdictions are working on incorporating training information into their MIS within the next few months. Vouchers for training are the primary source documents for tracking training costs. A monthly or quarterly report on training activities from contractors or agencies might be valuable. "Release Time Reports," "Attendence Verifications" and similar forms were reported. Some of these forms have perhaps been more trouble then they are worth. It was suggested that forms and other approaches to record-keeping be shared between jurisdictions.

V. NEW DIRECTIONS

It was suggested that a systems approach be taken to training, beginning with an analysis of the labor market that identifies the skills and competencies that will result in employment. An assessment is then made of the participant's interests and skills. A short and long-range career plan is developed. Career planning, values clarification and image-building efforts could be included. A strong action planning component is necessary that specifies supportive services and training that are directly related to the EDP. Skill acquisition is emphasized. A key factor for success would be the availability of a strong training coordinator, advocate or counselor who has a limited caseload(below 60:1) and has become intimately familiar with the needs of the participants and the agencies. Many jurisdictions feel that they will have success using an "RFP Approach" that strongly emphasizes training. Advertising for available PSE jobs referencing the training aspect and even including a syllabus has resulted in changing expectations and successful recruiting. Strong public relations efforts and the marketing of the CETA concept will be necessary to change community and potential employing agency attitudes.

APPENDIX 3

Appendix 3

EMPLOYING AGENCY SURVEY -- SAMPLING MATRIX

		State	City	County	PNP's	School Districts	Other Public Agencies	Total
		n = 18	n = 8	n = 11	n = 23	n = 5	n = 7	n = 72
Skagit	1	ss = 7	ss = 6	ss = 6	ss = 9	ss = 5	ss = 5	ss = 38
		% = 38	% = 75	% = 54	% = 39	% =100	% = 71	% = 53
		n = 3	n = 8	n = 8	n = 24	n = 8	n = 13	n = 64
Pierce	2	ss = 3	ss = 6	ss = 6	ss = 10	ss = 6	ss = 7	ss = 38
		% =100	% = 75	% = 75	% = 41	% = 75	% = 54	% = 57
		n = 15	n = 1	n = 0	n = 42	n = 2	n = 7	n = 67
Tacoma	3	ss = 7	ss = 1	ss = 0	ss = 13	ss = 2	ss = 5	ss = 28
		% = 47	% =100	% = 0	% = 31	% =100	% = 41	% = 42
		n = 1	n = 5	n = 4	n = 18	n = 1	n = 6	n = 35
Kitsap	4	ss = 1	ss = 5	ss = 4	ss = 7	ss = 1	ss = 5	ss = 23
		% =100	% =100	% =100	% = 38	% =100	% = 83	% = 66
		n = 15	n = 9	n = 15	n = 37	n = 10	n = 9	n = 95
Clark	5	ss = 8	ss = 7	ss = 8	ss = 11	ss = 7	ss = 7	ss = 48
		% = 53	% = 78	% = 53	% = 30	% = 70	% = 78	% = 51
		n = 1	n = 5	n = 1	n = 19	n = 12	n = 2	n = 40
Yakima	6	ss = 1	ss = 5	ss = 1	ss = 8	ss = 6	ss = 2	ss = 23
		% =100	% =100	% =100	% = 42	% = 50	% =100	% = 58
Spokane/		n = 1	n = 4	n = 2	n = 20	n = 3	n = 4	n = 34
City/	7	ss = 1	ss = 4	ss = 2	ss = 8	ss = 3	ss = 4	ss = 22
County		% =100	% =100	% =100	% = 40	% =100	% =100	% = 65
		n = 19	n = 6	n = 5	n = 22	n = 2	n = 0	n = 54
Thurston	8	ss = 8	ss = 5	ss = 5	ss = 9	ss = 2	ss = 0	ss = 29
		% = 42	% = 83	% =100	% = 41	% =100	% = 0	% = 54
King		n = 16	n = 0	n = 0	n = 95	n = 0	n = 0	n =111
Snohomish	9	ss = 7	ss = 0	ss = 0	ss = 19	ss = 0	ss = 0	ss = 26
E.S.		% = 44	% = 0	% = 0	% = 20	% = 0	% = 0	% = 22
		n = 0	n = 17	n = 15	n = 31	n = 12	n = 9	n = 84
Snohomish	10	ss = 0	ss = 7	ss = 7	ss = 10	ss = 6	ss = 6	ss = 36
		% = 0	% = 41	% = 47	% = 32	% = 50	% = 67	% = 44
		n = 0	n = 19	n = 38	n =156	n = 15	n = 14	n =242
King	11	ss = 0	ss = 8	ss = 12	ss = 31	ss = 7	ss = 7	ss = 65
		% = 0	% = 42	% = 31	% = 20	% = 47	% = 50	% = 27
		n = 0	n = 1	n = 0	n =106	n = 1	n = 10	n =118
Seattle	12	ss = 0	ss = 1	ss = 0	ss = 21	ss = 1	ss = 5	ss = 28
		% = 0	% =100	% = 0	% = 20	% =100	% = 50	% = 24
		n = 7	n = 13	n = 17	n = 26	n = 7	n = 3	n = 73
Whatcom	13	ss = 5	ss = 6	ss = 7	ss = 8	ss = 5	ss = 3	ss = 34
		% = 71	% = 40	% = 41	% = 31	% = 71	% =100	% = 46
		n = 7	n = 5	n = 11	n = 18	n = 7	n = 3	n = 51
Cowlitz	14	ss = 5	ss = 5	ss = 6	ss = 8	ss = 5	ss = 3	ss = 32
		% = 71	% =100	% = 50	% = 40	% = 71	% =100	% = 63
		n = 17	n =110	n = 86	n =256	n =138	n = 28	n =636
B'BOS	15	ss = 13	ss = 21	ss = 16	ss = 52	ss = 28	ss = 8	ss =137
		% = 76	% = 19	% = 20	% = 20	% = 19	% = 29	% = 21
		n =120	n =211	n =213	n =893	n =223	n =115	n =1776
Total		ss = 66	ss = 87	ss = 80	ss =224	ss = 84	ss = 67	ss =607
		% = 55	% = 41	% = 38	% = 25	% = 38	% = 58	% = 34

APPENDIX 4

Appendix 4

JURISDICTION: STATEWIDE TYPE OF AGENCY: (All Agencies)

SUMMARY
EMPLOYING AGENCY SURVEY

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA QUESTIONS

1. NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES IN YOUR ORGANIZATION? $\bar{X}$=228

2. NUMBER OF CETA EMPLOYEES WITHIN YOUR ORGANIZATION? $\bar{X}$=11

3. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU HAD CETA EMPLOYEES? $\bar{X}$=5

4. WOULD YOU CHARACTERIZE YOUR AGENCY AS BEING LOCATED IN(Check One) 216 URBAN OR 178 RURAL AREA? Both:14

5. DO YOU RECEIVE CETA FUNDS FROM MORE THAN ONE PRIME SPONSOR/PROGRAM AGENT?
92 YES 323 NO Blank:3

6. IF "YES", PLEASE INDICATE WHICH JURISDICTION YOU ARE RESPONDING TO. YOU MAY FILL OUT SEPERATE SURVEYS FOR EACH FUNDING SOURCE, IF YOU CHOOSE.

* * *

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR ANSWERS:	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
1. Do you routinely receive sufficient information about CETA/PSE?	336	46	36
2. Do you feel that you have a clear understanding of the goal of CETA/PSE?	381	20	17
3. Would an employing agency orientation meeting explaining CETA/PSE prior to receiving a placement be useful?	179	161	78
4. Have you received sufficient assistance from CETA to allow you to operate your PSE program effectively?	327	46	45
5. Do PSE staff visit you frequently enough to meet your needs?	295	65	58
6. Do the paperwork requirements of CETA create an unnecessary burden on your staff?	143	241	34
If "YES," what could be eliminated? (See Attached Sheet)			
7. Do you get consistent answers when calling the CETA office?	256	124	38
8. In your opinion, does the CETA/PSE program provide opportunities to the "most in need?"	201	64	153
9. Has the change in regulations requiring more training had a net benefit effect to your participants?	129	129	160
10. Do you currently provide training for your non-CETA employees?	334	62	22
11. Do you allow release time for your non-CETA employees to attend training?	355	49	14

		YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
12.	Can you schedule release time for your PSE employees without creating a burden on your organization?	305	68	45
13.	Recognizing that training is a part of PSE's purpose, how would you prefer scheduling release time? (Check One) 67 1-2hrs/day 12 3-4hrs/day 174 ½ day periodically 55 3-5 days/mo 50 On their own time 43 Other 17 Blank			
14.	Do you allow your PSE participants release time for job search?	372	21	25
15.	Would you use job-sharing(two employees sharing the same job, thus allowing one to cover the job while the other attends training)?	222	90	106
16.	Would you provide individualized instruction to your PSE participant using one of your staff, if CETA paid for the staff member's time while training?	300	37	81
17.	Would a workshop in "HOW TO CONDUCT TRAINING" be beneficial to your organization?	186	120	112
18.	Should employing agencies be responsible for providing participant training using CETA resources?	163	95	160
19.	Do you feel that training is helpful in the placement of your PSE employees?	317	17	84
20.	What suggestions do you have to improve PSE training? (See Attached Sheet)			
21.	Does your agency become actively involved in developing a written plan for training and transitioning your PSE participants(Employability Development Plan or Transition Plan)?	113	247	58
22.	Do you think that developing a written plan(EDP)helps participants get non-CETA jobs?	110	97	211
23.	Do you become involved in updating your participant(s) plan throughout the placement period?	117	214	87
24.	Does you agency provide any of the training recommended in the plan(EDP)?	183	75	160
25.	Could supervisors of PSE participants benefit from additional supervisory training?	226	81	111

		YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
26.	Are there barriers within your organization preventing transitioning PSE participants?	170	205	43
	If "YES", what are they? (See Attached Sheet)			
27.	How could transition of your PSE employee(s) be promoted? (See Attached Sheet)			
28.	Do you feel PSE employees receiving supportive services and/or training causes morale or other staff problems?	73	291	54
29.	How have the new regulations which went into effect April 1, 1979 affected your participation in CETA? (See Attached Sheet)			
30.	If the regulations were changed, would your organization supplement PSE salary above the supplementation limit?	148	88	182
31.	How would you use CETA/PSE to provide the maximum benefit to the community? (This Question Was Ambiguous; Coding Responces Was Unfeasible)			
32.	Do you view PSE as a funding source critical to your operation?	185	171	62
33.	Are your PSE employees provided with sufficient supportive services(transportation, childcare, etc.)?	198	78	142
34.	Would you be willing to negotiate with CETA to designate certain "trainee" positions which could be refilled when the participant is trained & transitioned into a non-CETA job?	295	31	92
35.	Will your organization continue to participate in PSE?	305	29	84
	If "NO", why? (See Attached Sheet)			
36.	In what job categories will your future PSE participants be placed? (See Attached Sheet)			

SAMPLE SIZE: 607

NUMBER OF SURVEYS RETURNED: 418(69%)

QUESTION 6:

"DO THE PAPERWORK REQUIREMENTS OF CETA CREATE AN UNNECESSARY BURDEN ON YOUR STAFF?" "IF 'YES,' WHAT COULD BE ELIMINATED?"

ELIMINATE:

Duplication of Reports	14
Confusing Reimbursement Procedures	10
Constant Revision/Change of Forms and Procedures	5
Requirement of a Large Number of Copies	4
Unclear Instructions	4
Separate Billing for Training Time	7
Position Status Notices	2
Need for Original Signatures on All Copies	2
Monthly Training & Job Search Activity Report	2
Most of the Paperwork	4
CETA Representatives	3
Closing & Re-Enrolling at End of Fiscal Period	2
Monthly Billing	3
Neccessity of Justifying Everything	5
Constant Updating of Contracts	3
CETA Deadlines Which Conflict With Agency Accounting Periods	2
Agency Doing CETA Paperwork & Payroll; Have CETA Do It All	4

QUESTION 20:

"WHAT SUGGESTIONS DO YOU HAVE TO IMPROVE PSE TRAINING?"

I WOULD:

Provide More Job-Related Training	31
Coordinate Training With Local Schools	12
Coordinate Training and Placement to Participant's Career Goals	15
Emphasize OJT(It's the Most Helpful)	18
Reimburse Agency for OJT	12
Provide More Training Money	16
Provide Individualized Training	7
Stress Basic Skill Training	7
Publicize Offerings More Effectively	6
Monitor Participant's Progress Toward Stated Training Goals	5
Coordinate Training Time With Agency	3
Get Agency Approval For Training	2
Provide Training Resources in Rural Areas	5
Stress Grooming/Good Work Habits	4
Ease-Up on Training Reimbursement	3
Train Participant Prior to Placement	4
Eliminate Job-Search Workshops(Worthless)	3
Shorten Workshop Length	2
Provide More Workshops on Mgt Skills	2
Provide More Personal/Job Counseling	5

QUESTION 26:

"ARE THERE BARRIERS WITHIN YOUR ORGANIZATION PREVENTING TRANSITIONING PSE PARTICIPANTS?"

"IF 'YES,' WHAT ARE THEY?"

Budget	110
Lack of Openings	34
Civil Service Rules	13
Agency Entry Requirmnts Greater Than Skill Levels	14
Poor Quality Participants	5
Competition For Positions	3
Agency Mgt Policies	2
Union Contracts	11

QUESTION 27:

"HOW COULD TRANSITION OF YOUR PSE EMPLOYEES BE PROMOTED?"

Increased Funding	59
Increased Number of Openings	11
Publicize Job Openings	9
More Job-Related Training	6
Subsidized Transition	6
Raise Salaries	3
Economic Devel of Community	4
More Training Opportunities	3
Develop Job Training Plan Prior to Placement	3

QUESTION 29:

"HOW HAVE THE NEW REGULATIONS OF APRIL 1, 1979 AFFECTED YOUR PARTICIPATION IN CETA?"

Reduced Participation	32
Ended Involvement	16
Increased Involvement	6
Led to Poor-Quality Partic	23
Difficult to Get Referrals	10
Salary Limit Problems	6
Salaries Too Low	10
Restricted Prof Positions	6
More Realeased Time	9
Poor Morale	8
More Paperwork/Red Tape	8
Too Much Supervision required	3

QUESTION 35:

"WILL YOUR ORGANIZATION CONTINUE TO PARTICIPATE IN PSE?" "IF 'NO,' WHY?"

Wages	23
Poor Quality Applicants	8
Too Much Paperwork/Red Tape	5
Union Problems	2
No Position Refills	2
Too Much Supervision	1
Difficult to Guarantee 50% Transition	1

QUESTIONS 36:

"IN WHAT JOB CATEGORIES WILL YOUR FUTURE PSE PARTICIPANTS BE PLACED?"

Health/Human Services	130
Clerical	168
Maintenance/Custodial	79
Education	59
Public Works	20
Conservation	12
Parks	15
Public Safety	15
Administration	10
Construction	11
Planning	9
Drivers	9
Technical	23
Food Service	9

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON REVERSE SIDE OF SURVEYS WERE:

Dissatisfaction with Low Wages, Delay in Reimbursement, Constant Changes, Poor Quality Participants

APPENDIX 5

Appendix 5

SAMPLE SIZE: 315 AREA: STATE-WIDE

SUMMARY TYPE OF AGENCY; (ALL AGENCY'S TOTAL)

CETA PSE PARTICIPANT SURVEY

		YES	NO	UNCERTAIN	N/A
1.	Did you receive an orientation to CETA in the first weeks of your current CETA job?	201	91	27	1
2.	Were you involved in writing a plan for your training & development(an EDP)?	127	164	24	2
3.	Is this plan realistic for you?	139	53	62	46
4.	Is this plan updated on a regular basis?	105	99	63	51
5.	Does your employer allow time off during working hours for you to attend training?	249	43	22	6
6.	Have you attended classroom training while you have been in your present CETA job?	186	125	4	1
7.	How much training have you received through CETA? X=1.90	(Number of Classes)			
8.	Do you feel you need more training?	197	69	31	19
9.	Has the training you have received helped you in your current CETA job?	180	84	27	25
10.	Do you think getting training increases your chances of finding a permanent job?	259	21	22	6
11.	Do you feel the training you have received to date will help you get a permanent non-CETA job?	187	64	46	19
12.	Are you able to find the courses or training you need?	195	55	46	24

13. What type of training have you received?(Check one or more):

104 Community College classes
27 Vocational School classes
144 Workshops/Seminars
126 Training conducted by your employer
7 Other(specify):
30 NONE
2 UNIVERSITY
1 SEARCH

14. What additional training do you need to help find a permanant job?(Please list):

(SEE ATTACHED SHEET FOR SUMMARY)

		YES	NO	UNCERTAIN	N/A
15.	Has the career counseling you have received from CETA been helpful?	129	100	48	25
16.	Have you received "support services"(transportation, child care, tools, etc.)from CETA?	106	198	15	4

(Continues on reverse...)

17. What problems do you feel may keep you from being successful on your current CETA job?

(SEE ATTACHED SHEET FOR SUMMARY)

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN	N/A
18. Has your agency talked with you about moving into a regular job after your CETA funding runs out?	147	148	19	5
19. Have you received assistance in job search & placement?	107	177	21	12
20. Was this assistance helpful?	81	88	48	80
21. Does you employer allow time off during work hours to look for a job?	199	70	45	12

22. What assistance do you need to help get a permanant job?

(SEE ATTACHED SHEET FOR SUMMARY)

23. What changes would you make to improve CETA?

(SEE ATTACHED SHEET FOR SUMMARY)

24. What do you want to do when your current PSE/CETA job is over?

99 Go to school	15 Take some time off	21 Other
131 Look for a job	7 Be unemployed	12 NO COMMENT
104 Start a new job already lined up	11 Don't know	21 TRANSITION

* * * * * * * * * * *

25. Do you work for (check one):

____State government	____County government	____School dist.
____City government	____Public non-profit agency	____Other public agency

26. Approximately how long were you unemployed before taking your current CETA job? $\bar{X}$=10.70 months.

27. How long have you been in your current CETA job? $\bar{X}$=8.13 months.

28. Is your area considered ____urban or ____rural? (Check one)

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 14:

"WHAT ADDITIONAL TRAINING DO YOU NEED TO HELP FIND A PERMANENT JOB?"

I NEED:

Higher Education, Degree Orientation	14
, General Coursework	32
Community College	6
Vocational Education	7
G.E.D.	2
OJT	24
Basic Communication Skills(Reading, Writing- etc.)	18
Job-Finding/Career Selection/Career Counseling	16
Personal Counseling(Self-Improvement)	6
Specific Job-Related, Career-Related Skill Acquisition	40
More Workshops, Classrooms, Education, Generally	15
Business/Accounting/Bookkeeping Skills	11
Clerical(Typing, Filing, Memo-Writing, etc.)	36
Teaching Certificate	3
Job/Career Internship/Apprenticeship	2
Special Education	1

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 17:

"WHAT PROBLEMS DO YOU FEEL MAY KEEP YOU FROM BEING SUCCESSFUL ON YOUR CURRENT CETA JOB?"

LACK OF:

Adequate Training Facilities	1
Handicapped Transportation	2
Job Advancement	1
Equity of Benefits(CETA/Non-CETA)	1
Job Information	1
Time-Provision for Job Search/Training	7
Adequate Pay	16
OJT/Training/Education	19
Transportation Assistance	7
Authority/Responsibility	15
Neccessary Personal Qualities/Self-Confidence/Motiv.	3
Transition	12
Support of Supervisor(s)	2
Information Re: CETA	1
Prospects for Continued Funding of Agency/CETA slot	13
Personal Counseling	1

EXISTENCE OF:

Too Much Red Tape	2
Interpersonal Conflicts with Supervisor(s)	11
Dishonesty/Malpractice on Part of Supervisor(s)	1
Restricted Rural Job Market	1
Sexism Re: Placement of Women in Non-Traditional Jobs	2
Racism in Certification Process	1
Ageism in Placement	1

(Please Turn Over...)

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 22:

"WHAT ASSISTANCE DO YOU NEED TO HELP GET A PERMANANT JOB?"

I NEED:

More Information About CETA	6
General & Specific Job Market Information Applicable to Geographic Area/Referrals/Current, Accurate Job Lists/A Job-Finding Network	31
Training for a Specific Career	15
General Education/Schooling	9
Tuition Aid	3
G.E.D.	1
More OJT	17
Time for Job Search	6
More and Better Quality Career Counseling	6
Help Learning to Take Exams, Tests, Like Civil Service	1
Reimbursement for Training Expences	8
Transportation	4
Training to Take Interviews	1
Personal Counseling	10
Conferences With CETA Coordinator	1
More Timely Reimbursement	1
Health Insurance	1
Child Care	1
Tools	1
Ramping in House	1
Lengthening of CETA Subsidy for Elderly	1
Jobs/Job Placement/Transition for Older Women	1
Improvement of Financial Condition in School District	1
Placement/Transition	10

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 23:

"WHAT CHANGES WOULD YOU MAKE TO IMPROVE CETA?"

I WOULD:

Build Transition Into CETA Programs	15
Provide More Money For and Increase Training/Support Services	14
Institute a Required Training Sequence With Monitoring	10
Attempt to Attract Better-Qualified Participants	6
Provide Better, More Timely CETA Orientation	17
Provide More Counseling/Require Counseling	11
Raise Pay	26
Provide Pay Raises After Six Months/Build-in Incentives	1
Pay Twice a Month	1
Provide For Full-Time Training or Schooling	1
Divide CETA Into a Two-Part Program: 1) Employment & Training; 2) Job Placement/Transition	1
Provide More Termination Notice	1
Increase Program From 18 to 24 Months	1
Provide/Require Employer Orientation	2
Increase Private Sector Involvement	1
Improve Communication with Unions	1

....Continuation of Summary, Question 23:

Allocate Funds Specifically For Improving/Building Image of CETA and CEAT Participants	4
Work to Increase Respect for CETA/CETA Participants with Employing Agencies	1
Reduce Red Tape	7
Select Employing Agencies More Carefully, Being Sure That They Have Adequate Budget to Meet Commitments	3
Eliminate "Free Lunch" Quality to CETA Subsidy	1
Upgrade Quality of Participants in Job Slots Demanding Prior Training/Technical Skills	1
Monitor Employing Agencies More Carefully/Regularly	8
Eliminate Emphasis on Project Completion in Title VI	1
Improve Content of CETA Workshops	1
Upgrade Quality of CETA Jobs With Fewer Menial, Demeaning Jobs/More Authority	4
Provide for Horizontal Mobility Within Agency	1
Target CETA for 18-23 Year-Olds	1
Eliminate Racism	1
Eliminate Barriers Encountered by the Elderly	1
Eliminate Barriers Encountered by the Handicapped	1
Eliminate Threat of Budget Cuts	2
Eliminate CETA Program	2

APPENDIX 6

Appendix 6

PSE TRAINING & TRANSITION ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP

-BELLINGHAM APRIL 29, 1980-

PROGRAM AGENT PARTICIPANTS:

Cloyd Campbell
CETA PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM
217 Grand Ave.
Bellingham, Wa. 98225
206-676-6755

Stuart Hansen
CETA PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM
217 Grand Ave.
Bellingham, Wa. 98225
206-676-6755

Jeanne Williams
Marlys Bourm
Peter Daniels
Linda Skinner
CETA PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM
217 Grand Ave.
Bellingham, Wa. 98225
206-676-6755

Michaele Meredith
Sue Rittmueller
CAREER DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
Prospect Mall 106-A
Bellingham, Wa. 98225

Bob Cook
SKAGIT COUNTY EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING
501 So. Third St.
Mt. Vernon, Wa. 98273
206-536-9499

Frank DeFreyatas
SKAGIT COUNTY EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING
501 So. Third St.
Mt. Vernon, Wa. 98273
206-536-9499

Lynette Edge
SKAGIT COUNTY EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING
501 So. Third St.
Mt. Vernon, Wa. 98273
206-536-9499

Susan Tinker
SKAGIT VALLEY COLLEGE
2405 College Way
Mt. Vernon, Wa. 98273

EMPLOYING AGENCY PARTICIPANTS:

Alan Davis
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
P.O. Box 487
Anacortes, Wa. 98221
206-293-3191

Steve White
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
P.O. Box 487
Anacortes, Wa. 98221
206-293-3191

Sharon Stewart
CEMETERY DISTRICT # 5
Rt. 1, Box 240B
Concrete, Wa. 98237
206-853-2141

Janice Leonardo
WHATCOM COUNTY EMERGENCY SERVICE
311 Grand Ave.
Bellingham, Wa. 98225
206-676-6681

Martha Borngribe
WHATCOM COUNTY EMERGENCY SERVICE
311 Grand Ave.
Bellingham, Wa. 98225
206-676-6681

Renae McFadden
NEW LEAF, INC.
1490 Allen West Rd.
Bow, Wa. 98232
206-757-0064

EMPLOYING AGENCIES (CONTI):

Catherine May
WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL ON AGING
217 Grand Ave.
Bellingham, Wa. 98225
206-733-4030

Dave O'Connell
WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL ON AGING
217 Grand Ave.
Bellingham, Wa. 98225
206-733-4030

Margaret Cowling
WHATCOM COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY
311 Grand Ave.
Bellingham, Wa. 98225
206-676-6784

Scott Finley
BELLINGHAM HOUSING AUTHORITY
409 York St.
Bellingham, Wa. 98225
206-676-6887

Kathleen Earnst
TOWN OF LA CONNER
P.O. Box 400
LaConner, Wa. 98257
206-466-3125

Bonnie Cjort
ARLINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT # 16
P.O. Box 309
Arlington, Wa. 98223
206-435-2156

Ruth Eklund
RETIRED SENIOR VOLUNTEER
1262 N. State St.
Bellingham, Wa. 98225
206-734-3055

Bob Harrington
WHATCOM COUNTY COMM ALCOHOL CENTER
1000 No. Forest
Bellingham, Wa. 98225
206-676-6871

Greg Cory
WHATCOM COUNTY COMM ALCOHOL CENTER
1000 No. Forest
Bellingham, Wa. 98225
206-676-6871

Ms. J.M. Jauhola
CAPE FLATTERY SCHOOL DISTRICT
P.O. Box 106
Clallam Bay, Wa. 98326

PSE TRAINING & TRANSITION ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP

TACOMA MAY 1, 1980

PRIME SPONSOR PARTICIPANTS:

Doug Booth
Bob Melton
Jerry Weakley
KITSAP COUNTY PERSONNEL
Kitsap County Courthouse
614 Division St.
Port Orchard, Wa. 98366
206-876-7185

Jim Sloan
Fran Herrick
John Cole
Ellen Ostern
PIERCE COUNTY MANPOWER PLANNING
Pierce County Annex
2401 So 35th St.
Tacoma, Wa. 98409
206-593-4940

Jim Grant
Rick Lerbaker
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
9505 Bridgeport Way SW
Tacoma, Wa. 98499

Jenny Allen
CITY OF TACOMA
Comprehensive Employment Service
740 St. Helens St.
Tacoma, Wa. 98402

EMPLOYING AGENCY PARTICIPANTS:

Sonja Smith
CLOVER PARK VOC-TECH INSTITUTE
4500 Steilacom Blvd. SW
Tacoma, Wa. 98499

Jack Asby
FORT STEILACOOM COMMUMITY COLLEGE
9401 Farwest Dr SW
Tacoma, Wa. 98498

George Ruther
TACOMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
5900 - 12th
Tacoma, Wa. 98465

Shirley Kidwell
TACOMA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
P.O. Box 1357
Tacoma, Wa. 98401
206-593-6855

Ester Wilfong
TACOMA PUBLIC SHCOOLS
P.O. Box 1357
Tacoma, Wa. 98401
206-593-6835

Kathleen Muir
ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE
1103 "A" St.
Tacoma, Wa. 98402

Marcus Pruitt
DOVE CENTER
Rt. 3, Box 35
Eatonville, Wa. 98401
206-832-6300

Lin Genda
BIG BROTHERS/BIG SISTERS
P.O. Box 5352
Tacoma, Wa. 98401
206-572-3211

Gary Bathhurst
PIERCE COUNTY LIBRARY
2356 Tacoma Ave. So.
Tacoma, Wa. 98402
206-572-6760

Tom Carlson
SUMNER SCHOOL DISTRICT
1202 Wood Ave.
Sumner, Wa. 98

EMPLOYING AGENCY PARTICIPANTS (CONTI):

Gary Nelson
PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT #402
315 So. 129th
Tacoma, Wa. 98444
206-532-0211 ext. 220

Mary Cloquet
COWLITZ INDIAN TRIBE
2815 Dale Lane East
Tacoma, Wa. 98424
206-922-9272

Sharon Hansen
PIERCE CO ASSO FOR RETARDED CITIZENS
39 Broadway
Tacoma, Wa. 98402
206-383-2643

Ruth Slaughter
LAKEWOOD SCHOOL DISTRICT #306
P.O. Box 220
Lakewood, Wa. 98259
206-652-7519

Genevieve Tucker
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BUSINESS
302 Broadway Terrace Bldg.
Tacoma, Wa. 98402
206-383-5081

Rodney Clare
BOY'S CLUB
614 E. 6th
Tacoma, Wa. 98409

Greg Tanbara
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
747 St. Helens St.
Tacoma, Wa. 98402
206-593-4502

Carleen Jackson
MARCH OF DIMES
2702 No. 21st
Tacoma, Wa. 98406
206-752-9255

L. Wildman
FIFE SCHOOL DISTRICT #417
5602 - 20th St. E.
Tacoma, Wa. 98424
206-922-6697

PSE TRAINING & TRANSITION ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP

SEATTLE APRIL 30, 1980

PRIME SPONSOR PARTICIPANTS:

Roger Caley
KING COUNTY OPSE
201 Smith Tower
Seattle, Wa. 98104
206-344-7306

Scott Winslow
KING-SNO MANPOWER CONSORTIUM
Room 1811 Smith Tower Bldg.
Seattle, Wa. 98104
206-625-5346

Paul Tomita
CITY OF SEATTLE PSE PROGRAM
400 Yesler Bldg. (6th floor)
Seattle, Wa. 98104
206-625-2705

Keith Williams
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
1601 2nd Ave. (3rd floor)
Seattle, Wa. 98101
206-464-5806

Mark Molina
Renee Peare
Al Chen
SNOHOMISH COUNTY CETA
112 Broadway
Everett, Wa. 98204
206-355-6636

EMPLOYING AGENCY PARTICIPANTS:

Chester Woods
COMMUNITY INSTITUTE FOR HUMAN DEV
340 - 15th Ave. E.
Seattle, Wa. 98112
206-323-4700

Jimmy Young
COMMUNITY INSTITUTE FOR HUMAN DEV
340 - 15th Ave. E.
Seattle, Wa. 98112
206-323-4700

Tim Moore
CAMP
722 - 18th Ave.
Seattle, Wa. 98122
206-329-4111

Sandra Fosshage
SEATTLE COUNSELING
1505 Broadway
Seattle, Wa. 98122
206-329-8737

Jim Mattson
DRUG ABUSE COUNCIL
2730 Pine
Everett, Wa. 98201
206-259-7142

Nan Naramoto
SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
815 - 4th Ave. No.
Seattle, Wa. 98109
206-587-5062

Marcia Peterson
SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
815 - 4th Ave. No.
Seattle, Wa. 98109
206-587-5062

Dick Seraile
OPERATION IMPROVEMENT
820 Empire Way South
Seattle, Wa. 98144
206-322-0825

EMPLOYING AGENCY PARTICIPANTS (CONTI):

Cliff Gillies
MUKILTEO SCHOOL DISTRICT
9481 Sharon Drive
Everett, Wa. 98204
206-353-5766

Tracy Heffelfinger
PLANNED PARENTHOOD
2211 E. Madison
Seattle, Wa...98112
206-447-2361

William Bleakney
MERCER ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT
4160 - 86th SE
Mercer Island, Wa. 98040

Armando Garcia
Darrell Paulson
Armando Castillo
COMMUNITY COUNSELING & INSTRUCTION
Mukilteo, Wa. 98275

Joe Nicholson
CITY OF NORTH BEND
P.O. Box 896
North Bend, Wa. 98045

John Gonsalez
SER/JOBS FOR PROGRESS
9826 - 14th Ave. SW
Seattle, Wa. 98106

Lillian Henry
TULALIP TRIBES
6700 Totem Beach Rd.
Marysville, Wa. 98270
206-659-6257

Joseph Garcia
SILENT ENVIRONMENT
P.O. Box 1026
Ellensburg, Wa. 98926
509-925-9603

Ann Drury
HIGHLINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Midway, Wa. 98031
206-878-3710

PSE TRAINING & TRANSITION ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP

OLYMPIA MAY 2, 1980

PRIME SPONSOR/PROGRAM AGENT PARTICIPANTS:

Nancy Pringle
EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING DIVISION
1007 So. Washington MS EL-01
Olympia, Wa. 98504
206-753-5250

Forest Cole
THURSTON COUNTY PSE
503 W. 4th
Olympia, Wa. 98501
206-753-8088

Jerry Longacre
THURSTON COUNTY PSE
503 W. 4th
Olympia, Wa. 98501
206-753-8088

Elizabeth Miller
THURSTON COUNTY PSE
503 W. 4th
Olympia, Wa. 98501
206-753-8088

Mary Stone
COWLITZ COUNTY EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING
1405 Delaware
Longview, Wa. 98632
206-577-3039

Steve McAllister
Janet Hansen
Frank Hoffman
Balance/Balance of State
CETA SERVICES EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
MS KG-11
212 Maple Park Dr.
Olympia, Wa. 98504

Terry Stauffer
CLARK COUNTY HUMAN RESOURCES
2400 "T" St. P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, Wa. 98661

Elaine Maull
CLARK COUNTY HUMAN RESOURCES
2400 "T" St. P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, Wa. 98661
206-699-2492

EMPLOYING AGENCY PARTICIPANTS:

Paul Peterson
DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL
600 So. Franklin
Olympia, Wa. 98504
206-7533368

Sandra Johnson
DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION CENTER
2112 So. Kelso Dr.
Kelso, Wa. 98626
206-636-1050

Janet Ryan
HALEYON HOUSE
P.O. Box 481
Quilcene, Wa. 98376

Katherne Boering
HALEYON HOUSE
P.O. Box 481
Quilcene, Wa. 98376

Dorothy Cox
CITY OF LONGVIEW
P.O. Box 128
Longview, Wa. 98632
206-577-3321

Margo Jensen
WA STATE DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING
Highways licenses Bldg. MS PB-01
Olympia, Wa. 98504
206-753-2478

EMPLOYING AGENCY PARTICIPANTS (CONTI):

Sue Johnson
WASHINGTON STATE LIBRARY
State Library Bldg. MS AJ-11
Olympia, Wa. 98504
206-753-3080

Barbara O'Neill
THURSTON COUNTY URBAN LEAGUE
915 Capitol Way
Olympia, Wa. 98501

Teasy Ryken
THURSTON COUNTY URBAN LEAGUE
915 Capitol Way
Olympia, Wa. 98501
206-352-1424

Bruce Webster
Janet Christian
CROSSOVER SEMINARS
P.O. Box 747
Port Angeles, Wa. 98362
206-452-3179

Robert Altig
CLARK CARE & DEVELOPMENT
1950 Fort Vancouver Way
Vancouver, Wa. 98661
206-696-0667

Teri Ramsauer
CRISIS CLINIC, INC.
P.O. Box 2463
Olympia, Wa. 98507
206-754-3888

Roger Bieber
MOSSYROCK SCHOOL DISTRICT
P.O. Box 478
Mossyrock, Wa. 98564

Bob DeBuhr
AMERICAN RED CROSS
1308 - 12th Ave.
Longview, Wa. 98632
206-423-7880

PSE TRAINING & TRANSITION ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP

WENATCHEE MAY 5, 1980

PROGRAM AGENT PARTICIPANTS:

Representatives(11)
JOB SERVICE CENTER CETA SERVICES
Various locations within the BALANCE OF STATE

EMPLOYING AGENCY PARTICIPANTS:

Doreen Purcell
NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL LIBRARY
238 Olds Station Rad
Wenatchee, Wa. 98801
509-663-1117

Kathy Bryant
WENATCHEE VALLEY COLLEGE
1300 Fifth St.
Wenatchee, Wa. 98801
509-622-1651

Jim Yates
WENATCHEE VALLEY COLLEGE
1300 Fifth St.
Wenatchee, Wa. 98801
509-622-1651

George Bartholomew
CHELAN DOUGLAS CAC
620 Lewis St.
Wenatchee, Wa. 98801
509-662-6156

Dave Hiklan
GRANT COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION
604 W. 3rd
Moses Lake, Wa. 98837
509-765-9206

Carol Green
CELAN DOUGLAS HEALTH DISTRICT
316 Washington St.
Wenatchee, Wa. 98801
509-663-2105

Sally McLanahas
SENIOR OPPORTUNITIES
608 E. Third
Moses Lake, Wa. 98837
509-765-9249

PSE TRAINING & TRANSITION ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP

TRI-CITIES MAY 9, 1980

PRIME SPONSOR/PROGRAM AGENT PARTICIPANTS:

Colleen McKeown
YAKIMA COUNTY DIV OF EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING
2011 So. 64th Ave.
Yakima, Wa. 98903
509-575-4252

Janelle Miner
Liz Mitchell
Janet Gifford
Betty Zerbach
Vicky Ward
YAKIMA COUNTY DIV OF EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING
2011 So. 64th Ave.
Yakima, Wa. 98903
500-575-4252

Representatives (5)
JOB SERVICE CENTER CETA SERVICES
various locations within the Balance of State

EMPLOYING AGENCY PARTICIPANTS:

Gwen Chaplin
PLANNED PARENTHOOD
208 No. 3rd Ave.
Yakima, Wa. 98902
509-248-3625

Evelyn Melendez
HELPLINE
P.O. Box 1773
Walla Walla, Wa. 99362
509-529-3377

Rosa Ramon
RADIO CADENA
P.O. Box 82
Granger, Wa. 98932
509-854-1900

Elizabeth Ortez
RADIO CADENA
P.O. Box 82
Granger, Wa. 98932
509-854-1900

Larry Jeter
KLICKITAT-SKAMANIA CAC
P.O. Box 267
Bingen, Wa. 98605
509-493-2662

Dick Hansen
ENTERPRISE FOR PROGRESS
33 So. 2nd Ave.
Yakima, Wa. 98902
509-575-2897

Genoreva Morales
NW RURAL OPPORTUNITIES
804 Decatur
Sunnyside, Wa. 98944
509-837-5003

Eldon Blanford
ZILLAH SCHOOL DISTRICT
P.O. Box 225
Zillah, Wa. 98953
509-829-5911

EMPLOYING AGENCY PARTICIPANTS (CONTI):

Linda Hyatt
ZILLAH SCHOOL DISTRICT
P.O. Box 225
Zillah, Wa. 98953
509-829-5911

Dr. John Armenia
SELAH SCHOOL DISTRICT #119
P.O. Box 398
Selah, Wa. 98942
509-697-7243

Ida Deaton
PLANNED PARENTHOOD
18 N-Auburn Box 6842
Kennewick, Wa. 99336
509-586-2164

Linda Weghorst
PLANNED PARENTHOOD
18 N-Auburn Box 6842
Kennewick, Wa. 99336
509-586-2164

Chris Myers
PLANNED PARENTHOOD
18 N-Auburn Box 6842
Kennewick, Wa. 99336
509-586-2164

Audrey Ogletree
KENNEWICK SCHOOL DISTRICT
200 So. Dayton St.
Kennewick, Wa. 99336
509-582-8233

Diana Bergevin
LILLIE RICE CENTER
1627 Evergreen Dr.
Walla Walla, Wa. 99362

PSE TRAINING & TRANSITION ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP

SPOKANE MAY 7, 1980

PRIME SPONSOR/PROGRAM AGENT PARTICIPANTS:

John Baumhofer
Ken Olson
Mel McCoy
Cayrl Anstadt
Judy Murphy
SPOKANE CITY COUNTY EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING
City Hall, Room 653
Spokane, Wa. 99201
509-456-5501

Leigh Hales
SPOKANE FALLS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
3410 Ft. Wright Drive
Spokane, Wa. 99204

Bill Phillips
PRE-VOCATIONAL TRAINING CENTER
N. 2526 Division
Spokane, Wa. 99207

EMPLOYING AGENCY PARTICIPANTS:

Charles Gutierrez
Richard Ball
CITY OF SPOKANE
City Hall, Rm. 251
N. 221 Wall
Spokane, Wa. 99201

Lorna Mello
SPOKANE COUNTY
Spokane County Courthouse
W. 1116 Broadway
Spokane,Wa. 99260

Roy Rosenau
SPOKANE SCHOOL DISTRICT
Roosevelt School, Rm. 2
S. 1415 Bernard
Spokane, Wa. 99203

Jim Hern
Colleen Wheatley
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
TAF-C-14
Spokane, Wa. 99202

Vic Forni
NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS
E. 2116 - 1st
Spokane, Wa. 99202

Joyce Feuersinger
SPOKANE COUNTY ASSO FOR RETARDED
P.O. Box 5301, NC Station
Spokane, Wa. 99205

Linda Boyle
Sharon MacPherson
Vince Hutnak
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
French Administration Bldg. Rm.240B
Pullman, Wa. 99164

William Copley
SPOKANE COUNTY HEALTH DISTRICT
W. 1101 College Ave.
Spokane, Wa. 99201
509-456-3630

Hazel Ellsworth
SPOKANE COUNTY HEALTH DISTRICT
W. 1101 College Ave.
Spokane, Wa. 99201
509-456-3630

EMPLOYING AGENCY PARTICIPANTS (CONTI):

Susan Clarke
INLAND EMPIRE GOODWILL, INC.
E. 130 - 3rd Ave.
Spokane, Wa. 99202
509-838-4246

Alice Kellar
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY
E. 502 Boone
Spokane, Wa. 99258
509-484-6096

Bruce Pennell
NE WASHINGTON RURAL RESOURCES
219 So. Elm
Colville, Wa. 99114
509-684-2515

Arthur Anderson
CITY OF COLFAX
N. 824 Main St.
Colfax, Wa. 99111

Beulah Townsend
MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS SOCIETY
W. 246 Riverside
Spokane, Wa. 99201

APPENDIX 7

Appendix 7

PSE Training & Transition Project

WORKSHOP DISCUSSION SUMMARY

As the final phase of the PSE Training & Transition Project, Productivity Associates held seven regional workshops statewide to review the findings and data in the PSE Participants and Employing Agencies Surveys and to give workshop participants an opportunity to focus upon basic issues which the surveys suggest. The following is a summary of the data collected during the discussions.

Workshops were held in Bellingham, Seattle, Tacoma, Olympia, Wenatchee, Spokane and Tri-Cities, representing a total attendance of 150 participants.

The major issues raised by the survey data are as follows:

- Employee Development Planning(EDP)
- New Type of PSE Participant(Title II-D)
- Quantity and Quality of PSE Training
- Barriers to Transition
- Employing Agencies Role in Training
- Average Annual Wage

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT PLANNING(EDP)

Several areas reported that they were using the EDP process with varying degrees of success. Some areas, especially in rural counties, do not give much attention to the process. It is widely felt that the employing agency should be involved in the EDP process from the start, but this may require a "selling job," as there is no apparent pay-off for the agency. Employees may lack the expertise thought necessary to do an EDP and frequently participants are unaware that it exists at all!

The EDP must be a realistic, on-going process, as opposed to being merely a static form. It must be related to real job market information, realistic skills assessment and acquisition, participant career goals and perhaps even a Target Job Description. If the EDP is to be realistic and have on-going value, it must involve the major actors--counselors, supervisors, the participant and perhaps even potential employers, with regular updates based upon progress assessment and goal reassessment. PSE staff should talk with supervisors about the goals and career direction of participants. The EDP process is difficult where the participant and other actors are not aware of career or job opportunities and their own motivation and goals. Some up-front work way be necessary to pave the way for wide-spread and successful use of the EDP. This may require the reorientation of employing agencies and training institutions which have not heretofore had to deal with the EDP. In some cases, it might be valuable to get the unions involved. The EDP may be completed after one month on the job and then updated every two or three months.

The EDP is, in some cases, the primary counseling tool of the employing agency, based upon interpersonal communication. In one instance, the EDP form was thought to be too rigid and complex. It was suggested that the form should function more as a format or guide. The EDP was described as being ideally a front-end function that sets the tone of the participant's experience with the employing agency. More assessment may be needed on the front-end. The Assessment Center does identify relevant factors at intake, perhaps they should be responsible for the EDP.

Under the present economic conditions, the EDP may have to be done with extra care, involve well-trained, skilled counselors with knowledge of the present, soft job market. Transition planning, foreinstance, might be a severe problem and alternative job or career goals might be required, based upon market analysis. The Prime might become more involved in assisting the agency in the EDP process.

The EDP should specifically address job search, using a simple form of action planning--the "what," "how," "where," and "who" approach. In these times, the EDP may well need to go beyond PSE to the private sector for jobs.

The politicalization of CETA was pointed out as a problem which may interfere with the EDP process. Often there are serious communication blockages between the participant and the PSE(JSC)staff.

Many employing agencies do not have the staff to do the EDP or the time, motivation, expertise. In addition, the EDP is impacted by two special factors: 1) the new type of participant, the "most-in-need," while benefiting from an EDP, is the most difficult to plan for. Long-range planning is difficult when the participant may be quite unskilled and unaware of his/her potentialities or goals. In addition, the present economy is particularly hard on the "most-in-need." What they need most is food and shelter--immediate survival concerns--and it may be unrealistic to ask them to set fairly sophisticated long-range career goals; 2) EDP's are more of a problem in rural areas, where the job market is chronically restricted and mobility is limited. The EDP process could lead to unrealistic expectations.

A Transition Plan, Agency Information Sheet and Contact Log are documents which supplement the EDP. The Information Sheet provides the agency with sign-off to include release time, performance appraisal, and transition.

Specialized training for transition is provided by Kittatas County. This involves an intensive job search workshop with follow-up within 90 days on a one-to-one basis. Transition rate for the first half of FY80 has been about 80%.

The EDP should include a placement plan to tie it to the real world. It should also provide for skills acquisitionand not just a job, some sort of job mobility or career mobility, provide career ladders to avoid "dead-ending." Carrer opportunities workshops are valuable.

NEW TYPE OF PSE PARTICIPANT(Title II-D)

After April, 1979, the target group for CETA PSE became the "most-in-need" or the"structurally unemployed." This has placed an unusual burden on the entire CETA program, because it fundamentally reorients it from being primarily a jobs program to that of being a training program. Participants are often less sophisticated socially, less prepared educationally and technically for gainful employ-

ment; they tend to be less work-oriented, need more counseling and other supportive services to keep them on the job and to prepare them for transition. The latter is particularly difficult, because it requires more and better quality training to achieve transition with the new type of participant. We need to assist them to increase productivity. This places a very big burden on employing agencies who are used to the old, more skilled, participants.

A basic problem for some participants is motivation. Work in this area is needed. The new participant needs more personal counseling, financial planning assistance, and placement services. Assessment for these participants must come early in the placement or even before placement as a front-end function, facilitated by CETA and repeated at pre-determined intervals. The new participant needs more on-the-job supervision also and more time away from the job site to make use of special training and other services. This places a burden on the employing egency, which is faced with the necessity of having to hire more people or tolerate a lower level of productivity. Again, what is the "pay-off" for the employing agency?

Public attitudes also affect the success of the new participant. The new Title II-D activities are sometimes looked upon as "give-away" programs and a certain stigma is attached to the "most-in-need."

Recruitment of the new participant has created some problems. How do we reach the "most-in-need?" Some agencies evaluate applicants using a point system. This can lead to abuses and certainly complications. In II-D, it is now possible to target certain types of needy participants, i.e., non-degree-holders.

The JSC's should take a bigger role in training and counseling the new type of participant. The BOS should give more responsibility and planning time to JSC's to respond to new needs of the program.

Both the public and the agencies need to be thoroughly reoriented not only to the new type of participant, but also to the new type of PSE program as well.

QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF TRAINING

Training, along with transition, is a fundamental part of the new CETA PSE program. It is the result of a compromise between the employee, who wants a job most, the employer, who wants the most job-ready and CETA, who wants the "most-in-need!" Therefore, training should be made available to all participants.

Being one of the more ambitious issues to be tackled at the workshops, more was said about the quality and quantity of training than other issues. Therefore, it was neccessary to break the topic down into component parts so that we can look, more easily, at the responses it generated:

Who Should Train and How Should Training Be Delivered?

In some jurisdictions, the major responsibility for training delivery seems to fall on the employing agency, although there is much interest in PSE playing a more aggressive assisting role. In other areas, PSE assumes major responsibility for training with employing agencies providing release time. The first step would seem to be to clarify just who in what agency is responsible for what part of the overall training effort. To the extent that it is the responsibility of the employ-

ing agencies they should be oriented to their new responsibilities. This would not only be to get them "on board", but also to show them how they might effectively use their resources in the training effort. This may require basic supervisory training and orientation to CETA rules and regulations, plus detailed orientation to local conditions. CETA orientation workshops are valuable prior to the release of RFP's.

In rural areas, training delivery is a problem because of the frequent scarcity of training facilities and instructors. This situation may be alleviated through the voc ed certification of tutors and through the use of correspondence courses such as the one offered by The Evergreen State College. Also, several agencies may pool their resources and buy shared training or may make use of workshops-on-wheels. Other specifically rural problems involve higher-than-average unemployment, the desire to stay put, rather than move to where the jobs are. CETA might be able to educate people away from the Seasonal Work/Public Assistance cycle.

Apprenticeship programs, run by professionals, are being used in some areas. Community colleges are a commonly-used training resource. On-site voc-ed certified tutors hired by the employing agency are another approach to skill-training. Tutored participants may then "challenge" community college courses for credit. For more than a few participants, a classroom situation can be provided.

Frequently, four-year colleges and community colleges have sequential courses which are not always in "sync" with participant training needs. This means that he or she might have to wait as many as 3 to 6 months before joining an academic training program. Sometimes, a community college or university can be induced to bring a training program into a remote community, when genuine, un-met training needs can be demonstrated.

Types of Training

Job-readiness
Communications Skills
The Three R's
Assertiveness
Job Search
Basic Skills
Specific, Job-related, "Hard" Skills
OJT

When Should Training Be Provided?

Some workshop participants felt that training needs vary with the needs of the participant and the agency and so should be met flexibly at any time during the placement. Others felt that training needs should be assessed up-front as part of the PSE CETA orientation process. Training should perhaps come before placement so that the participant will be job-ready. In the Seattle School District, orientation includes job-readiness skills, how to deal with the world of work, and skills training for the job. Alternatives to front-end training and orientation are OJT, training during placement, but during release time, during "off-time" in a tandem position, or during training time on a non-traditional 32-hour work week.

Successful Training Programs

Walla Walla Job/Work Orientation: Provides training within 60 days, including actual application of what's learned, discussion and feedback of results

Skagit Valley Diesel Mechanics Program: Recruited members through advertising in local papers, saying that it was a training program with job placement outside the local area. Up-front advertising helped screen out people who would not fully benefit from the program, i.e., would not be willing to move out of the area for job placement.

Kittitas County Demonstation Project: 40-hour orientation to CETA, including job-readiness, orientation to the world of work, etc.($230 per head)

Politicalization of CETA

A good example of this politicalization is the freeze on Title VI. This kind of uncertainty causes major credibility problems for PSE program staff dealing with employing agencies and participants. "A contract is a contract," they say. A formal explanation from DOL to the contractors is needed so that they can attempt to explain things to sub-contractors and participants. DOL needs to be better informed about local procedures and practices(an awareness of reality for the people being served). More two-way communication is needed.

BARRIERS TO TRANSITION

One of the principal barriers to transition is the lack of non-CETA funding in agencies which are targeted to employ the transitioned participant. And in today's economy, this will become more and more of a problem. There will not only be a lack of funding, but also fewer job vacancies. One is certainly tempted to ask the question: "Has inflation outdated II-D?"

Motivation and job readiness is also a factor affecting transition. Some participants make little progress during their subsidized employment and are passed over after termination in favor of a new participant or an "outside" applicant. This might be particularly true if the new type of participant has not gotten adequate training.

The whole transition problem should be attacked early in the employment process. Plans for transition can be built into the EDP process along with provisions for job-finding workshops, job-readiness training, etc. Job development efforts would also help with transition. All of these activities require people working together--the counselor, the supervisor, the pariticpant, the program agent and the employing agency.

The average annual wage is itself a barrier to transition, as trainees and "below-entry-level" placements are one more step away from regular civil service classifications of governmental employing agencies.

The 18-month limit may place too much of a restriction on participants and employers in their training endeavors. It may not be enough time for a participant to achieve job-readiness. By combining programs and titles(II-B, II-D, OJT, etc.), participants could manage to stay in a placement for as long as 2 to 2½ years. and be job-ready at completion. Extending the 18-month limit on the basis of transition rate may provide an incentive to employers also, however, internal politics within CETA hinders this sort of flexibility.

Often employers do not understand the CETA program or feel encumbered by the number of job developers "hitting them up" for jobs. One jurisdiction is doing something about this: organizing job developers in the county so that their individual functions are co-ordinated.

Often private industry does not have any way of absorbing terminated participants. Designated "training positions" within industry is a potentially useful approach.

More reliable labor market information will affect transition positively by stimulating more realistic training and transition planning.

On occasion, the participant will rely too heavily on subsidized employment, feeling that his position will be extended indefinitely or knowing that he or she might fair quite well on some other government program, perhaps public assistance. This underscores the importance of attitudinal change in effective transitioning.

Follow-up on transition may be required to more adequately account for positive and non-positive transition. Walla Walla follows up on a 30-60-90-day basis as part of a job-readiness contract. Positive transition within the same agency(as in a school district)must conform to internal personnel rules. Large numbers of qualified "outside" people are competing for the same jobs, some with more training than the terminated participant. Employers will always want to choose the "best qualified."

Training for employment in <u>either</u> the public or private sector might raise the transition rate. Targeting for jobs in fields which tend to have a fair number of vacancies over a broad geographic area of the state or nation (to affect mobility)may be an effective practice. An example is police training.

The key to successful transition, of course, is to make the CETA system work! If all parts are working together effectively and the participant wants it, transition will happen.

EMPLOYING AGENCIES ROLE IN TRAINING

The new CETA training requirement has caught some employing agencies by surprise. Others are aware of their responsibilities in this area but do not have a thorough enough understanding of the fundaments of training or do not have the resources with which to present effective training programs.

The first need, therefore, is better orientation to the new process, to CETA rules and regulations and the goals and purposes of CETA for all present and prospective employers. This might be done in a one-day workshop setting prior to RFP's or assignment of participants to employing agencies.

Employing agencies need assistance from Primes in setting up training programs. The prime should develop core training programs and set parameters for training front-end. The agency can assist in the designing of the specific programs. Participants need to know more about CETA--their rights and responsibilities in the program before their placement. They also need work-readiness skills. This orientation and training can be provided by CETA through the agency early in the placement.

In cases where employing agencies cannot afford or do not have the expertise to develop new training programs, they could pool resources to set up cooperative

regional training programs and hire instructors. They can also subcontract pre-assessment services.

There are some innovative approaches to training that employing agencies should have more information about. Job-sharing can facilitate an employee's being able to get time release for training. While the in-training participant is off getting trained, the "matched" employee is on the job, filling the slot they share. The unions should be brought into discussions about job-sharing in order to gain their backing. The agency should pay a training wage while a participant is in training. Teachers' aides can be effectively trained during the summer. Upgrading and retraining can be effected using Title II-C.

The employing agency should be part of the team approach to training, working with counselors, the Prime, and the participant. The employing agency can help the participant clarify values for decision-making, even without an EDP. The agency staff can provide training using a Structured Training Plan(STP) in a classroom/instructional setting.

In many cases, OJT provided by the employing agency is effective, but the educational component in training is very important and OJT is frequently not reimbursable as training.

To a great extent, where an RFP is used, it includes the training an employer will be expected to provide. Advertising for PSE positions also helps to define the training role of the employing agency.

There are several different types of training an employing agency may provide; these include:

OJT
Individualized Instruction Using an STP
In-Service Training
Provision for Release Time to Attend Classroom Training
Tutoring for Specific Skill Development
Co-operative Training Among Several Agencies
Job-readiness Training

This can be further facilitated by innovative approaches to on-the-job experience including job-sharing and rotation within a series of jobs to expose participants to several aspects of the same career or several career areas.

When writing a grant or otherwise bidding for a PSE position, the employing agency should allow for planning time to develop relevant training programs in conjunction with CETA.

It may be in the best interests of the employing agency to develop in-service training programs, as this may result in increased overall training and preparedness of all agency personnel.

AVERAGE ANNUAL WAGE

The Average Annual Wage(AAW) seems to have arisen from the need to target the CETA program(Title II-D) to the "most-in-need." While this may help to pre-screen potential CETA participants and hasten transition(Who can live on a wage like that?!), it has also tended to raise more issues than it has laid to rest.

For one thing, it discourages potentially "good" participants from enrolling in CETA because they find that the wage is too low or because they have a pretty fair chance of making more on welfare; the stigma is about the same, some say. This adds to the burden on welfare because recipients will not transition to CETA jobs. There should be a greater discrepancy between public assistance and CETA or CETA might fold. Secondly, employing agencies might pull out of CETA due to the restrictiveness of the Average Annual Wage. Some have a hard time integrating participants into their pay scale because the Average Annual Wage puts them well below the bottom of the pay scale. Unions are upset because the participant comes in below the bottom of the pay scale. Unions are upset because the participant comes in below the negotiated entry-level wage required by the contract. Many "good" employees and employers have been lost due to this. The union problem might be alleviated by creating "trainee" and "apprenticeship" slots.

The Average Annual Wage may be outdated anyway because of inflation. Perhaps participants cannot really survive on it. It may be supplemented by training wages or in-kind supportive services, but many employers are not sure about the rules regarding this. Supplementation might attract people away from public assistance.

Some provision should be made for wage increases. Perhaps a participant should be started at a training wage and then be given a raise to a working wage after a probationary period has been successfully served.

Some have suggested working with welfare on the Average Annual Wage problem, but there is some objection to this.

In some rural areas, however, the Average Annual Wage relates favorably with prevailing local wages. In fact, it seems to be helpful in turning the program toward the "most-in-need" and seems to be serving more people for less. Also, it has attracted more women to the program.

If a non-standard work week is used (e.g., 35 hours), time could be alloted for training within the confines of the Average Annual Wage.

How the Average Annual Wage is calculated may have to change. It is inconsistent between many counties. The computation of hours and rates is different every month-- being based upon the number of days in the month, and accounting procedures are cumbersome.

Employing agencies may need clearer definition of what is a wage and what is a fringe benefit (such as sick leave).

Yakima County instituted a child care system which uses CETA participants (developmental aids) as workers and serves the children of CETA participants. This is a very innovative program for creating meaningful work and providing effective wage supplementation.